arXiv:1605.07447v3 [math.AC] 8 Aug 2016

COMPLETION AND TORSION OVER COMMUTATIVE DG RINGS

LIRAN SHAUL

ABSTRACT. Given a noetherian ring $\Bbbk$, let $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ be the category whose objects are pairs $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, where A is a commutative DG $\Bbbk$-algebra and $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is a finitely generated ideal, and whose morphisms $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ are morphisms of DG $\Bbbk$-algebras $A \to B$, such that $(\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}})) \subseteq \bar{\mathfrak{b}}$. Letting $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk})$ be its homotopy category, obtained by inverting adic quasi-isomorphisms, we construct a functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk})$ which takes a pair $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ into its derived $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adic completion. We show that this operation has, in a derived sense, the usual properties of adic completion, and that if $A = \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is an ordinary noetherian ring, this operation coincides with ordinary adic completion. There is a canonical map $A \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. When this map is an isomorphism, A is called cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete. Such DG-rings are the affine pieces of derived formal algebraic geometry. We also associate to each $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}\,)$ local homology and local cohomology functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$ with respect to $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$, and show that they satisfy the usual relations which hold over noetherian rings, including the Greenlees-May duality.

CONTENTS

0. Introduction 1
1. Preliminaries 7
2. Derived completion and derived torsion of DG-modules 14
3. Derived completion of commutative DG-rings and adic maps 21
4. Derived completion of continuous DG-ring homomorphisms 40
5. The functors $\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$ 47
6. Finiteness conditions 50
References 57

0. INTRODUCTION

All rings in this paper are commutative and unital.

0.1. **Motivation: a well behaved category of derived rings over a noetherian ring.** Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring. When doing commutative algebra and algebraic geometry over $\Bbbk$, it is convenient to work with categories of noetherian $\Bbbk$-algebras which are closed under standard operations. A good candidate for such a category is $\mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$, the category of essentially finite type $\Bbbk$-algebras. All of its object are noetherian $\Bbbk$-algebras, and moreover it is closed under tensor products and localizations. In particular, if $f : A \to B$ is a map in $\mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$, then every localization of f, $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \to B_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is contained in $\mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$, and hence, so is every fiber ring $B_{\mathfrak{q}} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}} A_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}A\mathfrak{p}$. There is however one important algebraic operation which one cannot perform in $\mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$: adic completion. Given $A \in \mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$, and given an

The author acknowledges the support of the European Union for the ERC grant No 257004-HHNcdMir.

ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$, the $\mathfrak{a}$-adic completion $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)$ will rarely be essentially of finite type over $\Bbbk$. To overcome this deficiency of $\mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$, one may replace it with the category $\mathsf{FEFT}_{\Bbbk}$ of formally essentially of finite type $\Bbbk$-algebras (this terminology is from [30]). An object of this category is a pair $(A, \mathfrak{a})$ where A is a noetherian $\Bbbk$-algebra, $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$ is an ideal, A is $\mathfrak{a}$-adically complete, and the induced map $\Bbbk \to A/\mathfrak{a}$ is essentially of finite type. A morphism $(A, \mathfrak{a}) \to (B, \mathfrak{b})$ is any morphism of $\Bbbk$-algebras $f : A \to B$ which is continuous with respect to the adic topologies. Replacing the notions of localization and tensor product with completed localization and completed tensor product, one obtains a category $\mathsf{FEFT}_{\Bbbk}$ which contains the essentially of finite type $\Bbbk$-algebras (these are given the 0-adic topology), and is closed under completed tensor products, completed localizations and completions, and is thus, a good candidate for a category of nice algebraic objects over $\Bbbk$. Furthermore, each of these algebraic operations extends to an operation over the category of modules, so, for instance, given $A, B \in \mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$, the box tensor product over $\Bbbk$ gives a functor

$$\operatorname{Mod}(A) \times \operatorname{Mod}(B) \to \operatorname{Mod}(A \otimes_{\Bbbk} B), \tag{0.1}$$

and similarly for localization, completion, the completed localization and the completed tensor product.

From a homological point of view, however, both of these categories are problematic. It was long known (at least since Serre's book [22]) that given two maps $A \to B, A \to C \in \mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$ unless B, C happen to be tor-independent over A, the tensor product algebra $B \otimes_A C$ does not contain all information one would expect it to have. For instance, in the absence of tor-independence, it is impossible in general to derive (0.1) and obtain a derived tensor product functor

$$\mathsf{D}(B) \times \mathsf{D}(C) \to \mathsf{D}(B \otimes_A C).$$

(see [28, Tag 08J2] for a concrete counterexample).

Another example of this problem is observed when one constructs the fiber of a morphism. As Avramov and Foxby showed in [1], unless the map $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \to B_{\mathfrak{q}}$ happens to be flat, the fiber ring $B_{\mathfrak{q}} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}} A_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ does not give the correct result.

To repair these problem and have correct tensor products, one must replace $B \otimes_A C$ with the more complicated derived tensor product $B \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A C$. This object will be a commutative ring if and only if B, C are tor-independent over A. In other situations, this object is no longer a commutative ring. Instead, it is a derived commutative ring. There are various ways to represent derived commutative rings. In this paper we represent them with commutative differential graded rings. With this construction, one can replace the category $\mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$ with a category of commutative DG $\Bbbk$-algebras A which are noetherian in a cohomological sense, and such that $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is essentially of finite type over $\Bbbk$ (such DG-rings are sometimes called cohomologically essentially of finite type). With respect to a suitable notion of localization (with respect to multiplicatively closed subsets of $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$), one obtains a good homological replacement of $\mathsf{EFT}_{\Bbbk}$, $\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk}$, which is closed under derived tensor products and localizations. In particular, for any pair of maps $A \to B$ and $A \to C$ in $\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk}$, one obtains a functor

$$\mathsf{D}(B) \times \mathsf{D}(C) \to \mathsf{D}(B \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A C).$$

To give just one example on what one can do with this category, let us mention [25, Theorem 7.6], where we have shown, working in this category, that the flat base change property of Grothendieck duality can be generalized to finite flat dimension base change.

In view of the discussion above, the next natural question to ask is: what are adic completions of the objects in $\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk}$? Before answering this question, we observe that operations such as the derived tensor product are only defined up to quasi-isomorphisms.

Just like in linear homological algebra, given $M, N \in \operatorname{Mod} A$, the complex $M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A N$ is only well defined in $\mathsf{D}(A)$, to actually obtain a functor with takes maps $A \to B, A \to C$ in $\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk}$ to $B \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A C$, one must invert quasi-isomorphisms in $\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk}$, and obtain its homotopy category $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk})$. Then, one obtains an object $B \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A C \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk})$.

Thus, we now ask the main question this paper answers: given $A \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk})$, and given an ideal in A (i.e, an ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$), what is the adic completion of A with respect to $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$? Notice that the ring $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$, and hence the ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ are invariant under quasi-isomorphisms. Whatever the answer to this question is, to be a well defined on $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CoEFT}_{\Bbbk})$, given a quasi-isomorphism $f : A \to B$, it must induce a quasi-isomorphism between the $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adic completion of A and the $\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$-adic completion of B. Recalling that unless one restricts to noetherian modules over noetherian rings, adic completion is not an exact operation (it is not even exact in the middle), one encounters a highly non-trivial problem.

The main aim of this paper is to answer this question, and construct a non-abelian derived completion functor. The construction carried out here works very generally, and associates to every commutative non-positive DG-ring A, and every finitely generated ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$, the derived $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adic completion of A. The construction is functorial, invariant under quasi-isomorphisms, and also extends to DG-modules, in the sense that there is a derived completion functor from $\mathsf{D}(A)$ to $\mathsf{D}(\widehat{A})$.

It follows that we will obtain a category of cohomologically formally essentially of finite type DG-rings over $\Bbbk$, which is closed under derived completed tensor products, derived completed localizations and derived completions, and that each of these operations $A \to B$ give rise to a corresponding functor on the derived categories $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$. Such a category is a good candidate for the category of good algebraic objects over $\Bbbk$.

0.2. **Main results.** We now describe the contents of this paper. In Section 1 we recall some basic facts about completion, torsion, commutative DG-rings, and their homotopy category. In particular, we introduce the category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ of commutative DG-rings over a fixed commutative ring $\Bbbk$, and its homotopy category $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$. We define the notion of a left homotopy between two morphisms in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ (Definition 1.1), and study the basic properties of this notion. We also introduce the categories $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$ and $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ whose objects are commutative DG-rings A equipped with an adic topology on the ring $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$. Maps in the former category induce adic maps on H^0, and more generally, maps on the latter induce continuous maps on H^0 with respect to the adic topology. We endow $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$ and $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ with homotopical categories structure, and obtain their homotopy categories $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk})$ and $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk})$.

In Section 2, which is a chapter in linear homological algebra, we associate to a commutative DG-ring A, and a finitely generated ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ local cohomology and derived completion functors

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A),$$

which, when A is a commutative ring which is noetherian (or more generally, when $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is weakly proregular) coincide with the usual local cohomology and derived completion functors. Moreover, we show that they satisfy the usual relations which hold in case A is an ordinary ring and $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is weakly proregular, but a new phenomenon shows up: while over commutative rings, in order to have these relations one must assume that A is noetherian or $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is weakly proregular, in this derived setting these results hold for any finitely generated ideal. Along the way we introduce in Definition 2.1 a technical notion, central to this paper, called **a weakly proregular resolution** of a pair $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, and show (Proposition 2.2) that any such pair has a weakly proregular resolution.

Section 3 and 4, which are of homotopical nature, are the main technical heart of this work. In them we construct, given a pair $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ the derived $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adic completion of it, denoted by $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, and study some basic properties of this construction. The construction is carried out in two steps. First, in Section 3 we construct the derived completion of DG-rings and adic maps between DG-rings. Then, in Section 4 we extend this operation further to continuous maps. We show that weakly proregular resolutions can be used to compute this functor, both on objects and on maps, and that there is a natural map (in the homotopy category) from a commutative DG-ring to its derived completion. Our main technical observation (Lemma 3.10) is that over a base noetherian ring $\Bbbk$, semi-free DG-rings in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ are weakly proregular. The main theorem, extracted from Theorem 3.19 and Theorem 4.13 is the following result:

Theorem 0.2. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring. There is a functor*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk})$$

and a natural transformation

$$\boldsymbol{\tau} : 1_{\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk})} \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda$$

such that the following properties hold:

(P1) *For any $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$, and any weakly proregular resolution*

$$P = (g, P_A, \mathbf{a})$$

of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, there is an isomorphism $\varphi_P : \widehat{P}_A \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$ making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_A & \xrightarrow{g} & A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \boldsymbol{\tau}_A} \\ \widehat{P}_A & \xrightarrow[\varphi_P]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \end{array}$$

commutative.

(P2) *Given a morphism $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$, and weakly proregular resolutions $P = (g, P_A, \mathbf{a})$, $P' = (h, P_B, \mathbf{b})$ of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ and $(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ respectively, for any map $P_f : P_A \to P_B$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ making the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_A & \xrightarrow{P_f} & P_B \\ {\scriptstyle g}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B \end{array}$$

commutative, and such that $P_f(\mathbf{a}) \subseteq \mathbf{b}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{P}_A & \xrightarrow{\widehat{P}_f} & \widehat{P}_B \\ {\scriptstyle \varphi_P}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_{P'}} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$ is commutative.

We also show in Section 3 that this operation is idempotent, and that for noetherian rings (or more generally, for weakly proregular ideals), this construction coincides with the usual adic completion functor.

Given a commutative ring A, and a finitely generated ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$, the $\mathfrak{a}$-torsion and $\mathfrak{a}$-adic completion of an A-module M have the structures of modules over the $\mathfrak{a}$-adic completion of A. The same is true for their derived functors, so one obtains functors

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}}, \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)).$$

Building on Theorem 0.2, Section 5 introduces and studies generalizations of these constructions to the commutative DG-setting. Thus, for any commutative DG-ring A, and any finitely generated ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$, we obtain functors

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})),$$

and show that they satisfy various relations with the functors $\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(-,-), - \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A -$. Once again, this generalize known results from the case of rings and weakly proregular ideals (particularly the results of [24]), but with the extra feature that no noetherian or weak proregularity assumptions are needed.

In Section 6.1 we study the behavior of the above constructions under some finiteness conditions. We introduce the notions of a cohomologically noetherian DG-rings, and a DG-ring with a noetherian model. The following result is extracted from various results in Section 6.1:

Theorem 0.3. *Let A be a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring which has a noetherian model. Let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be an ideal. Then the following holds:*

1. *The DG-ring $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ is also cohomologically noetherian and has a noetherian model.*
2. *The map $A \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ is of flat dimension 0.*
3. *For any $M \in \mathsf{D}^-_{\mathrm{f}}(A)$, there is a functorial isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M) \cong M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(A).$$

Finally, in Section 6.2, we answer the question raised in Section 0.1, and describe a category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\mathbb{k}}$, of cohomologically formally essentially of finite type DG-rings over a noetherian ring $\mathbb{k}$, which is closed under all standard algebraic operation. This category is exactly the category of reasonable affine derived formal schemes over a noetherian ring. We summarize the results of that section in the following theorem:

Theorem 0.4. *Let $\mathbb{k}$ be a noetherian ring, and consider the category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\mathbb{k}}$ of cohomologically formally essentially of finite type $\mathbb{k}$-algebras.*

1. *The category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\mathbb{k}}$ contains the essentially of finite type $\mathbb{k}$-algebras, and the formally essentially of finite type adically complete $\mathbb{k}$-algebras.*
2. *For any $A, B \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\mathbb{k}}$, we have that*

$$A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\mathbb{k}} B \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\mathbb{k}},$$

and associated to these objects are derived completed box tensor product and derived torsion box tensor product functors

$$\mathsf{D}(A) \times \mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\mathbb{k}} B)$$

given by

$$(M, N) \mapsto \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}(M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\mathbb{k}} N), \quad (M, N) \mapsto \mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}(M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\mathbb{k}} N).$$

(3) *For any* $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$*, and any multiplicatively closed subset* $\bar{S} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$*, we have that* $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(\bar{S}^{-1}A, \bar{S}^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$*, and associated to these objects is a derived completed localization functor*

$$\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(\bar{S}^{-1}A, \bar{S}^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$$

given by

$$M \mapsto \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{S}^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\bar{S}^{-1}(M))$$

(4) *For any* $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$*, and any finitely generated ideal* $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ *that contains* $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$*, we have that*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk},$$

and associated to these objects is a derived completion functor

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})).$$

Also described in Section 6.2 are adic generalizations of Shukla homology and cohomology.

0.3. **Related works.** We end this introduction by discussing some related works. In [9, Section 9] the authors describes a theory of local cohomology over a commutative, not necessarily non-positive DG-ring. Under a noetherian assumption which holds in the applications they have for that theory in their paper, their local cohomology coincides with ours. The recent paper [4] describes a general framework to describe isomorphisms generalizing the Greenlees-May duality. Presumably, our version of it for commutative DG-rings (Proposition 2.12) falls under this framework. Other related papers in this context are [5, 6], which describes a similar formal theory, which, presumably could also be used to construct the theory of Section 2, and the recent [18] which further extends the MGM equivalence.

Regarding Section 3, the only similar construction we are aware of is [14, Section 4], where Lurie constructs derived completion in a spectral setting. Lurie's construction is easy to carry out, but it seems difficult to work with it in commutative algebra, nor any functorial properties of this construction are discussed there. In contrast, our construction is quite difficult to carry out (it takes the majority of Section 3), but it is very easy to work with in commutative algebra: we work in a strictly (graded) commutative setting, and to compute our derived completion, we identify a large class of commutative DG-rings (called weakly proregular DG-rings) which serve as resolutions in this context, on which derived completion is naturally isomorphic to ordinary adic completion. Moreover, the fact that our construction is functorial is in some sense the main point of this paper, as it shows that there are interesting natural morphisms between derived completions of DG-rings and ordinary adically complete noetherian rings (see Example 6.14).

Finally, regarding the constructions of Sections 4, 5 and 6, as far as we know they are completely new, and never been carried out before in any similar derived framework.

1. PRELIMINARIES

We will freely use the language of derived categories over rings and DG-rings, including resolutions of unbounded complexes ([27]) and unbounded DG-modules ([11]).

1.1. **The category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ and its homotopy category.** We begin by recalling some basic notions from the theory of commutative DG-rings. We follow the definitions and notations of [32, 33] (this includes using the term "DG-ring" instead of the somewhat more common "DG-algebra", see [33, Remark 1.4] for a justification). A commutative DG-ring is a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded ring

$$A = \bigoplus_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} A^n$$

and a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear differential $d : A \to A$ of degree $+1$, such that $d(a \cdot b) = d(a) \cdot b + (-1)^i \cdot a \cdot d(b)$, for all $a \in A^i$, $b \in A^j$, and such that $b \cdot a = (-1)^{i \cdot j} \cdot a \cdot b$, and $a \cdot a = 0$ if i is an odd integer. We shall further assume that A is non-positive, i.e, that $A^i = 0$ for all $i > 0$. For a DG-ring A, following [32, Definition 1.3(2)], we will sometimes denote $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ by $\bar{A}$. Accordingly, ideals of the commutative ring $\bar{A}$ will be denoted by $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$. The natural map $A \to \bar{A}$ will be denoted by π_A. We denote by $\mathrm{DGMod}(A)$ the category of (unbounded) DG-modules over A, and by $\mathsf{D}(A)$ its derived category. In particular, if $A = A^0$ is a ring, $\mathrm{DGMod}(A)$ is simply the category of unbounded complexes of A-modules.

Fixing a commutative DG-ring $\Bbbk$, we denote by $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ be the category of commutative non-positive DG-rings over $\Bbbk$. A map in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ is a morphism of commutative DG-rings which is $\Bbbk$-linear. If $\Bbbk = \mathbb{Z}$, the initial object of the category of commutative DG-rings, we simply denote it by CDG. A map $A \to B$ of commutative DG-rings is called semi-free if it induces an isomorphism $B \cong A \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[X]$ of graded commutative rings, where X is a graded set of variables. In this case, B is K-projective over A. According to [33, Theorem 3.21], any map of commutative DG-rings $A \to B$ can be factored as $A \to \tilde{B} \to B$, such that $A \to \tilde{B}$ is semi-free, and $\tilde{B} \to B$ is a surjective quasi-isomorphism.

If $\Bbbk$ is a ring, and moreover it contains $\mathbb{Q}$, there is a model structure on $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$, in which the weak equivalences are the quasi-isomorphisms, the fibrations are the surjections, and the generating cofibrations are the semi-free maps. It is very convenient to do homotopy theory with this model structure. Unfortunately, if $\Bbbk$ does not contain $\mathbb{Q}$, there is no such model structure on $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$. In general, according to [29, Theorem 9.7], for any commutative ring $\Bbbk$, the category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ has another model structure, with the expected weak equivalences and cofibrations. However, it is not known what are the fibrations in this model structure. In any case, since such a model structure exist, we deduce immediately that the category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$, with weak equivalences being quasi-isomorphisms is a homotopical category, in the sense of [7, Section 33]. In particular, we may form its homotopy category $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$, obtained by formally inverting quasi-isomorphisms, and deduce that it is locally small.

Despite the fact that quasi-isomorphisms, surjections and semi-free maps do not define a model structure on $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ in general, we shall now show that many features of model category theory remain true for these three classes of maps. We begin by borrowing from Quillen's model category theory the notion of a left homotopy.

Definition 1.1. Let $\Bbbk$ be a commutative DG-ring, and let $f, g : A \to B$ be two maps in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$. We say that f, g are left homotopic over $\Bbbk$ if:

(1) There is factorization $A \otimes_{\Bbbk} A \xrightarrow{\alpha} C \xrightarrow{\beta} A$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ of the diagonal map $A \otimes_{\Bbbk} A \to A$, such that the map $\beta : C \to A$ is a quasi-isomorphism, and

(2) Letting $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 : A \to A \otimes_{\Bbbk} A$ be the two natural maps $A \to A \otimes_{\Bbbk} A$, there is a map $h : C \to B$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$, such that $h \circ \alpha \circ \sigma_1 = f$ and $h \circ \alpha \circ \sigma_2 = g$.

The following implication is standard in model category theory.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a commutative DG-ring, denote by $Q_{\Bbbk}$ the localization functor $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$, and let $f, g : A \to B$ be left homotopic maps over $\Bbbk$. Then*

$$Q_{\Bbbk}(f) = Q_{\Bbbk}(g).$$

Proof. Following the notation of Definition 1.1, we have that

$$Q_{\Bbbk}(1_A) = Q_{\Bbbk}(\beta \circ \alpha \circ \sigma_1) = Q_{\Bbbk}(\beta \circ \alpha \circ \sigma_2)$$

But $Q_{\Bbbk}(\beta)$ is invertible, so we deduce that

$$Q_{\Bbbk}(\alpha \circ \sigma_1) = Q_{\Bbbk}(\alpha \circ \sigma_2),$$

which implies that

$$Q_{\Bbbk}(f) = Q_{\Bbbk}(h \circ \alpha \circ \sigma_1) = Q_{\Bbbk}(h \circ \alpha \circ \sigma_2) = Q_{\Bbbk}(g).$$

□

The next result is an analogue of [8, Proposition 7.6.13] in this context.

Proposition 1.3. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a commutative DG-ring, and let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & B \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ C & \longrightarrow & D \end{array}$$

be a commutative diagram in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$, such that f is semi-free and g is a surjective quasi-isomorphism.

(1) *There is a map $h_1 : C \to B$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ making the diagram*

(1.4)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & B \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \overset{h_1}{\nearrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ C & \longrightarrow & D \end{array}$$

commutative.

(2) *If $h_2 : C \to B$ is another map in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ making the diagram (1.4) commutative, then h_1, h_2 are left homotopic over A.*

Proof. The existence (1) is [33, Theorem 3.22(i)]. Assume $h_1, h_2 : C \to B$ are two such maps. Let $C \otimes_A C \xrightarrow{i} E \xrightarrow{j} C$ be a factorization of the diagonal map $C \otimes_A C \to C$ such that i is semi-free and j is a surjective quasi-isomorphism. Because $h_1 \circ f = h_2 \circ f$, the two maps h_1, h_2 induce a map $h_1 \otimes h_2 : C \otimes_A C \to B$. We obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} C \otimes_A C & & \xrightarrow{h_1 \otimes h_2} & & B \\ {\scriptstyle i}\downarrow & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ E & \xrightarrow[j]{} & C & \longrightarrow & D \end{array}$$

in CDG_A, in which i is semi-free, and g is a surjective quasi-isomorphism. Hence, by (1), there is a map $\phi : E \to B$, making the diagram



commutative, so we get a diagram



proving the claim. □

We record some immediate corollaries of this proposition that will be used in the sequel.

Corollary 1.5. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a commutative DG-ring.*

(1) *Let $X \in \mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk$, and let $a : A \to X$ and $b : B \to X$ be two quasi-isomorphisms in $\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk$, such that A, B are semi-free over $\Bbbk$, and such that b is surjective. Then there is a $\Bbbk$-linear quasi-isomorphism $h : A \to B$, unique up to a left homotopy over $\Bbbk$, making the diagram*



commutative.

(2) *Let $f : X \to Y$, $a : A \to X$ and $b : B \to Y$ be maps in $\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk$, and assume that a, b are quasi-isomorphisms, that A, B are semi-free over $\Bbbk$, and that b is surjective. Then there is a map $\tilde{f} : A \to B$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk$, unique up to a left homotopy over $\Bbbk$, making the diagram*



commutative.

Proof. These follow from applying the proposition to the commutative diagrams



□

The next result, a variation of [8, Lemma 7.3.8], is the key homotopical fact used in this paper,

Proposition 1.6. *Let $\Bbbk, \ell$ be commutative DG-rings, and let $F : \mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk} \to \mathsf{CDG}_{\ell}$ be a functor. Suppose that F satisfies the property:*

- *For any quasi-isomorphism $\alpha : A \to B$ between two DG-rings which are semi-free over $\Bbbk$, the map $F(\alpha) : F(A) \to F(B)$ is also a quasi-isomorphism.*

Then given two maps $f, g : X \to Y$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ which are left homotopic over $\Bbbk$, and such that X is semi-free over $\Bbbk$, we have that $F(f)$ and $F(g)$ are left homotopic over ℓ.

Proof. By definition, there is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \rightrightarrows & X \otimes_{\Bbbk} X & \longrightarrow & C & \xrightarrow{p} & X \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \\ & & & & Y & & \end{array}$$

such that the first composition from X to Y is equal to f, and the second one is equal to g, and the map $p : C \to X$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Notice that by factoring the map $X \otimes_{\Bbbk} X \to C$ as a semi-free map followed by a quasi-isomorphism, we may assume without loss of generality that the map $X \otimes_{\Bbbk} X \to C$ is semi-free. Since the maps $X \to X \otimes_{\Bbbk} X$ are semi-free, we deduce that C is semi-free over $\Bbbk$. Hence, the property of F implies that $F(p) : F(C) \to F(X)$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Applying the functor F, we obtain a diagram of ℓ-linear maps

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F(X) & \rightrightarrows & F(C) & \xrightarrow{F(p)} & F(X) \\ & & \downarrow & & \\ & & F(Y) & & \end{array}$$

which implies that $F(f)$ is left homotopic to $F(g)$ over ℓ. □

1.2. **Standard functors over** $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$**.** For the next constructions, we first make some set theoretic remarks. Fix a Grothendieck universe $\mathcal{V}$, and assume that $\mathsf{CDG} \in \mathcal{V}$, and that for any $A \in \mathsf{CDG}$, we have that $\mathrm{DGMod}(A), \mathsf{D}(A) \in \mathcal{V}$. Let Cat be the category of $\mathcal{V}$-small categories, and fix a Grothendieck universe $\mathcal{U}$, such that $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, and such that $\mathsf{Cat} \in \mathcal{U}$. We give Cat the canonical model structure (see [19]). Recall that the weak equivalences in this structure are exactly the equivalences of categories. The homotopy category $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat})$ has the same objects, but its morphisms are natural equivalence classes of morphisms. Any map $f : A \to B$ of commutative DG-rings give rise to these functors:

$$- \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A B, \quad \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(B, -) : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$$

and the forgetful functor $\mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$. As is well known, if f is a quasi-isomorphism then each of these three functors is an equivalence of categories. We now use this fact to extend them to $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$.

Define functors

(1.7)

$$\mathrm{L}(-)^* : \mathsf{CDG} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat}), \quad \mathrm{R}(-)_* : \mathsf{CDG}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat}), \quad \mathrm{R}(-)^\flat : \mathsf{CDG} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat}).$$

as follows: on objects, each of $\mathrm{L}(-)^*$, $\mathrm{R}(-)_*$ and $\mathrm{R}(-)^\flat$ map $A \in \mathsf{CDG}$ to the category $\mathsf{D}(A) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat})$. Given $f : A \to B$ in CDG, $\mathrm{L}f^* : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$ is given by $- \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A B$, $\mathrm{R}f_* : \mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$ is the forgetful functor, and $\mathrm{R}(-)^\flat : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$ is given by

$\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(B,-)$. Since $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat})$ identifies naturally equivalent functors, it is clear that $\mathrm{L}(-)^*$, $\mathrm{R}(-)_*$ and $\mathrm{R}(-)^\flat$ are functors. Moreover, they all map quasi-isomorphisms to isomorphisms, so they induce functors

$$\mathrm{L}(-)^* : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat}),$$

$$\mathrm{R}(-)_* : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat}).$$

and

$$\mathrm{R}(-)^\flat : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat}).$$

In particular, using either of these functors, we see that the operation

$$\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{Cat}), \quad A \mapsto \mathsf{D}(A)$$

is well defined, so that we may speak about the derived category of an object of $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$.

1.3. **Derived tensor products.** Fix a commutative DG-ring $\Bbbk$. There is a functor

$$\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk \times \mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk \to \mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk,$$

given by $(A,B) \mapsto A \otimes_\Bbbk B$. In this section we will construct its non-abelian derived functor. We begin by constructing an analogue of the fibrant cofibrant replacement functor in this context.

Proposition 1.8. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a commutative DG-ring, and let $Q_\Bbbk : \mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk)$ be the localization functor. There is a functor $\mathrm{SF}_\Bbbk : \mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk)$, and a natural transformation $\mathrm{SF}_\Bbbk \to Q_\Bbbk$, such that for any $A \in \mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk$, $\mathrm{SF}_\Bbbk(A)$ is semi-free over $\Bbbk$, and the map $\mathrm{SF}_\Bbbk(A) \to A$ is equal to $Q_\Bbbk(i_A)$, where $i_A : \mathrm{SF}_\Bbbk(A) \to A$ is a surjective quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. For any $A \in \mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk$, factor $\Bbbk \to A$ as $\Bbbk \to \tilde{A} \xrightarrow{i_A} A$, with $\Bbbk \to \tilde{A}$ being semi-free, and $\tilde{A} \to A$ being a surjective quasi-isomorphism. Given a map $f : A \to B$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk$, by Proposition 1.3(1), there is a map $i_f : \tilde{A} \to \tilde{B}$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk$ such that $f \circ i_A = i_B \circ i_f$. Let $\mathrm{SF}(A) := \tilde{A}$, and $\mathrm{SF}(f) := Q_\Bbbk(i_f)$. If $g : B \to C$ is another map, then there are two commutative diagrams



in which the left vertical map is semi-free and the right vertical map is a surjective quasi-isomorphism, so by Proposition 1.3(2), we see that $\mathrm{SF}(g \circ f) = \mathrm{SF}(g) \circ \mathrm{SF}(f)$, which implies that indeed SF is a functor, and the collection of maps i_A is a natural transformation. □

Using this functor, we may define the derived tensor product functor

$$- \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_\Bbbk - : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk \times \mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk) = \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk) \times \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_\Bbbk)$$

by letting

$$- \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_\Bbbk - := \mathrm{SF}_\Bbbk(-) \otimes_\Bbbk \mathrm{SF}_\Bbbk(-).$$

This is well defined since $\mathrm{SF}_{\Bbbk}$ preserves quasi-isomorphisms, and since for any $A \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$, we have that $\mathrm{SF}_{\Bbbk}(A)$ is K-flat over $\Bbbk$. K-flatness also ensures that there is a derived tensor product functor

$$\mathsf{D}(A) \times \mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B).$$

In the special case where $A = B$, we can say more: We may consider the functor

$$\Delta : \mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk} \to \mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}, \quad A \mapsto A \otimes_{\Bbbk} A.$$

This functor comes equipped with a natural transformation $\Delta \to 1_{\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}}$, given by the diagonal map $A \otimes_{\Bbbk} A \to A$. Again, we may form the derived functor

$$\mathrm{L}\Delta : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}),$$

and deduce that there is a natural transformation $\mathrm{L}\Delta \to 1_{\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})}$. Hence, for any $A \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$, there is a natural map

$$\Delta_A : A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} A \to A \tag{1.9}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$, given by the composition

$$A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} A = \mathrm{SF}_{\Bbbk}(A) \otimes_{\Bbbk} \mathrm{SF}_{\Bbbk}(A) \to \mathrm{SF}_{\Bbbk}(A) \to A.$$

The functor $(\Delta_A)^{\flat} : \mathsf{D}(A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$ is called Shukla cohomology, or derived Hochschild cohomology. See [2, 33] for a study of this functor.

1.4. **Completion and torsion over commutative rings, and weakly proregular ideals.** Given a commutative ring A, and a finitely generated ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$, the $\mathfrak{a}$-torsion and $\mathfrak{a}$-adic completion functors are given by

$$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) := \varinjlim_{n} \mathrm{Hom}_A(A/\mathfrak{a}^n, -), \quad \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) := \varprojlim_{n} A/\mathfrak{a}^n \otimes_A -.$$

These are both additive functors

$$\mathrm{Mod}(A) \to \mathrm{Mod}(A),$$

so they have derived functors

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}, \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A).$$

It is clear that the functor $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is idempotent. By [31, Corollary 3.6], $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is also idempotent. We denote by $\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}}$ the radical of the ideal $\mathfrak{a}$. It is also an ideal, but it need not be finitely generated in general. There are equalities

$$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) = \Gamma_{\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}}}(-), \quad \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) = \Lambda_{\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \tag{1.10}$$

of functors

$$\mathrm{Mod}(A) \to \mathrm{Mod}(A).$$

Given an element $a \in A$, the infinite dual Koszul complex associated to it, $\mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(A; a)$ is the complex

$$0 \to A \to A[a^{-1}] \to 0$$

concentrated in degrees $0, 1$. Given a finite sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ in A, we let

$$\mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(A; \mathbf{a}) := \mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(A; a_1) \otimes_A \cdots \otimes_A \mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(A; a_n).$$

This is a bounded complex of flat A-modules, so in particular it is K-flat. By [3, 15, 21], the sequence $\mathbf{a}$ is called **weakly proregular** if for any injective A-module I and any $k > 0$, we have that

$$H^k(\mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(A; \mathbf{a}) \otimes_A I) = 0.$$

As shown in [21, Proposition 1.2], this notion depends only on the ideal generated by $\mathbf{a}$. Hence, we say that a finitely generated ideal is weakly proregular if some (equivalently, any) finite sequence that generates it is weakly proregular. It follows ([3, Lemma 3.1.1], [21, Theorem 1.1], [15, Corollary 4.26]) that $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathfrak{a}$ are weakly proregular if and only if there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \cong M \otimes_A \mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(A; \mathbf{a})$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$. According to [15, Section 5], the complex $\mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(A; \mathbf{a})$ has an explicit bounded free resolution $\mathrm{Tel}(A; \mathbf{a})$, called the telescope complex. In particular, $\mathrm{Tel}(A; \mathbf{a})$ is K-projective. By [21, Theorem 1.1], [15, Corollary 5.25], $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathfrak{a}$ are weakly proregular if and only if there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathrm{Tel}(A; \mathbf{a}), M)$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$.

The A-module $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)$ has the structure of a commutative ring, sometimes denoted by $\widehat{A}$. The map $A \to \widehat{A}$ is a map of commutative rings, and if A is noetherian, it is flat.

If A is non-noetherian, this map can fail to be flat (even if $\mathfrak{a}$ is weakly proregular). For any $M \in \mathrm{Mod}(A)$, the A-modules $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(M), \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$ have the structure of $\widehat{A}$-modules, so one obtains additive functors

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}}, \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathrm{Mod}(A) \to \mathrm{Mod}(\widehat{A}),$$

and hence derived functors

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}}, \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\widehat{A}).$$

If $Q : \mathsf{D}(\widehat{A}) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$ is the forgetful functor, there are natural isomorphisms

$$Q \circ \mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}} \cong \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}, \quad Q \circ \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}} \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}.$$

According to [24, Theorems 3.2, 3.6], if $\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathbf{a}$ are weakly proregular then there are isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \cong (M \otimes_A \mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(A; \mathbf{a})) \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A \widehat{A}$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \cong \mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathrm{Tel}(A; \mathbf{a}) \otimes_A \widehat{A}, M)$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\widehat{A})$. See [23, 24, 26, 20] for more information about these functors.

Let A, B be commutative rings, and let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$, $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq B$ be finitely generated ideals. Given a map $f : A \to B$, if $f(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$ then f is continuous with respect to the adic topologies generated by these ideals. Of particular importance are the continuous maps f such that $f(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot B = \mathfrak{b}$. Such a map f is called an adic map.

1.5. **The categories $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$ and their homotopy categories.** Fix a commutative ring $\Bbbk$. By an ideal of definition for an adic topology on a commutative DG-ring A, we shall simply mean a finitely generated ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A} = \mathrm{H}^0(A)$. We define the categories $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}, \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ as follows: for both categories, their objects are pairs $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, where A is a commutative DG-ring over $\Bbbk$, and $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is an ideal of definition for an adic topology on A. A morphism $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ is a $\Bbbk$-linear morphism of commutative DG-rings $f : A \to B$, such that $\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \subseteq \bar{\mathfrak{b}}$. A morphism $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$ is a morphism of commutative DG-rings over $\Bbbk$ $f : A \to B$, such that the map $\mathrm{H}^0(f)$ is adic, that is, there is an equality $\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(B) = \bar{\mathfrak{b}}$. Note that $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$ is a subcategory of $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$.

We do not know if $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}, \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ have natural model structures. However, they do carry the structure of homotopical categories, in the sense of [7, Section 33].

The weak equivalences in both categories are simply maps in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\mathbb{k}}$ which are quasi-isomorphisms. Since quasi-isomorphisms are the weak equivalences of the homotopical category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathbb{k}}$, it is clear that weak equivalences in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\mathbb{k}}$ and $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\mathbb{k}}$ satisfy the two out of three property and the two out of six property (in the sense of [7, Section 33.1]), so they are also homotopical categories. Every homotopical category has a homotopy category ([7, Section 33.8]). We denote the homotopy categories of $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\mathbb{k}}$ and $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\mathbb{k}}$ by $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\mathbb{k}})$ and $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\mathbb{k}})$. As the forgetful functors

$$\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\mathbb{k}} \to \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\mathbb{k}} \to \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathbb{k}}, \quad (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \mapsto (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \mapsto A$$

clearly preserve quasi-isomorphisms, they induce forgetful functors

$$\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\mathbb{k}}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\mathbb{k}}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathbb{k}}).$$

We will frequently apply these forgetful functors implicitly.

2. Derived completion and derived torsion of DG-modules

Let A be a commutative DG-ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A} = \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be a finitely generated ideal. In this section we will associate to $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ a pair of functors

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$$

which, in case A is a ring and $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is a weakly proregular ideal, will coincide with the ordinary derived $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-torsion and derived $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adic completion functors. This section is a chapter in ordinary homological algebra, and no homotopical methods will be used in it. The following is the key technical definition of this paper.

Definition 2.1.

(1) A weakly proregular DG-ring is a pair $(A, \mathbf{a})$, such that A is a DG-ring which is K-flat over A^0, and $\mathbf{a}$ is a finite sequence of elements in A^0 which is weakly proregular.
(2) Given a commutative DG-ring A and a finitely generated ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$, a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ is a triple $(f, B, \mathbf{b})$, such that $(B, \mathbf{b})$ is a weakly proregular DG-ring, $f : B \to A$ is a quasi-isomorphism of DG-rings, and such that
$$\pi_A(f(\mathbf{b})) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(A) = \bar{\mathfrak{a}}.$$
(3) Given a weakly proregular DG-ring $(A, \mathbf{a})$, we define its completion $\widehat{A}$ to be the $(\mathbf{a})$-adic completion of A.

Proposition 2.2. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal. Then $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ has a weakly proregular resolution.*

Proof. Choose a finite sequence of elements $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ in A^0, whose image in $\bar{A}$ generates $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$. Let $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \to A$ be the map $x_i \mapsto a_i$, and let

$$\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \to B \xrightarrow{f} A$$

be a semi-free resolution of this map. Letting $\mathbf{b}$ be the image of $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in B^0, one may verify (see Lemma 3.10 below) that $(f, B, \mathbf{b})$ is a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. □

We will now associate to a weakly proregular resolution P of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ derived torsion and derived completion functors, which we will temporarily denote by $\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-), \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)$. This notation is temporary, as it will be shown below that these functors are independent of the chosen weakly proregular resolution.

Definition 2.3. Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A} = \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be a finitely generated ideal, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the ideal in B^0 generated by $\mathbf{b}$. We define the derived torsion and derived completion functors associated to P as follows: the operations

$$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(-) := \varinjlim_n \operatorname{Hom}_{B^0}(B^0/\mathfrak{b}^n, -), \quad \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(-) := \varprojlim_n B^0/\mathfrak{b}^n \otimes_{B^0} -$$

define additive functors $\mathrm{DGMod}(B) \to \mathrm{DGMod}(B)$. Let

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}, \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}} : \mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$$

be their derived functors, and set

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) := \mathrm{L}f^*(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}f_*(-))) \quad \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) := \mathrm{R}f^\flat(\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}f_*(-))).$$

These are triangulated functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$.

The next proposition provides explicit formulas for computing $\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the ideal in B^0 generated by $\mathbf{b}$. Then there are isomorphisms*

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(-) \cong \mathrm{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} -$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(-) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{B^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}), -)$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$. Hence, there are isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{L}f^*(\mathrm{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} \mathrm{R}f_*(-))$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{R}f^\flat(\operatorname{Hom}_{B^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}), \mathrm{R}f_*(-)))$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$.

Proof. Let $M \in \mathsf{D}(B)$, let $M \xrightarrow{\simeq} I$ be a K-injective resolution over B, and let $P \xrightarrow{\simeq} M$ be a K-projective resolution over B. By definition, we have that

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(M) = \Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(I)$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(M) = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(P).$$

Let $\mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0} : \mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(B^0)$ be the forgetful functor. Because the map $B^0 \to B$ is K-flat, it follows that $\mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0}(I)$ is K-injective over B^0, and that $\mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0}(P)$ is K-flat over B^0.

According to [15, Equation (4.19)], there is a functorial B^0-linear homomorphism

$$v_{\mathbf{b},\mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0}(I)} : \Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0}(I)) \to \mathrm{K}^\vee_\infty(B^0; \mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} \mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0}(I),$$

and since I has a B-linear structure, it is easy to check that this map is B-linear, that is, there is a B-linear map

$$v_{\mathbf{b},I} : \Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(I) \to \mathrm{K}^\vee_\infty(B^0; \mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} I \tag{2.5}$$

such that

$$\mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0}(v_{\mathbf{b},I}) = v_{\mathbf{b},\mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0}(I)}.$$

Hence, to check that $v_{\mathbf{b},I}$ is a quasi-isomorphism, it is enough to show that $v_{\mathbf{b},\mathrm{Rest}_{B/B^0}(I)}$ is a quasi-isomorphism, and this follows from [15, Corollary 4.25]. Thus, there are functorial isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(M) \cong \mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(B^0;\mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} I \cong \mathrm{K}^{\vee}_{\infty}(B^0;\mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} M \cong \mathrm{Tel}(B^0;\mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} M,$$

proving the first claim. The second statement is proved similarly, using [15, Definition 5.16] and [15, Corollary 5.23]. In particular, for any K-flat DG-module P, there is a functorial B-linear isomorphism

$$\mathrm{tel}_{\mathbf{b},P} : \mathrm{Hom}_{B^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(B^0;\mathbf{b}), P) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(P). \tag{2.6}$$

□

Proposition 2.7. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)) \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$.

Proof. Let $M \in \mathsf{D}(A)$, and let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the ideal in B^0 generated by $\mathbf{b}$. By definition, we have natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M)) = \\ \mathrm{R}f^{\flat} \circ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}} \circ \mathrm{R}f_* \circ \mathrm{L}f^* \circ \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}} \circ \mathrm{R}f_*(M) \cong \\ \mathrm{R}f^{\flat} \circ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}} \circ \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}} \circ \mathrm{R}f_*(M), \end{aligned}$$

and using Proposition 2.4, we have an isomorphism of functors

$$\mathrm{R}f^{\flat} \circ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}} \circ \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}} \circ \mathrm{R}f_*(M) \cong \mathrm{R}f^{\flat} \circ \mathrm{Hom}_{B^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(B^0;\mathbf{b}), \mathrm{Tel}(B^0;\mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} \mathrm{R}f_*(M)).$$

According to [15, Equation (5.6)], there is a B^0-linear homomorphism

$$u_{\mathbf{b}} : \mathrm{Tel}(B^0;\mathbf{b}) \to B^0.$$

Setting $T := \mathrm{Tel}(B^0;\mathbf{b})$ and $N := \mathrm{R}f_*(M)$, this map give rise to a B-linear homomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}(1_T, \mathrm{Hom}(u_{\mathbf{b}}, 1_N)) : \mathrm{Hom}_{B^0}(T, N) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{B^0}(T, \mathrm{Hom}_{B^0}(T, N)).$$

According to [16, Lemma 7], $\mathrm{Hom}(1_T, \mathrm{Hom}(u_{\mathbf{b}}, 1_N))$ is a quasi-isomorphism, so we deduce that there is a natural isomorphism $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(M)) \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(M)$ in $\mathsf{D}(B)$, and clearly this is enough to establish the claim. □

Definition 2.8. Given a commutative DG-ring A and a finitely generated ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$, the category of cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-torsion DG-modules, denoted by $\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)$, is the full triangulated subcategory of $\mathsf{D}(A)$ whose objects are DG A-modules M, such that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the $\bar{A}$-module $\mathrm{H}^n(M)$ is $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-torsion.

Remark 2.9. Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. For any $M \in \mathsf{D}(A)$, there is a natural map

$$\sigma^P_M : \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M) \to M$$

in $\mathsf{D}(A)$ defined as follows: Let $N := \mathrm{R}f_*(M) \in \mathsf{D}(B)$, and let $N \xrightarrow{\simeq} I$ be a K-injective resolution over B. We have a sequence of natural morphisms:

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(N) = \Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(I) \to I \cong N$$

in $\mathsf{D}(B)$. Let $\sigma_N^{\mathfrak{b}}$ be the composition of these maps, and define σ_M^P to be the composition of $\mathrm{L}f^*(\sigma_N^{\mathfrak{b}})$ with the natural isomorphism $\mathrm{L}f^*(N) \cong M$.

Proposition 2.10. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Then the following holds:*

(1) *For any $M \in \mathsf{D}(A)$, we have that*
$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(M) \in \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A).$$
(2) *For any $N \in \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)$, the map*
$$\sigma_N^P : \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(N) \to N$$
is an isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}(A)$.
(3) *For any $M \in \mathsf{D}(A)$, the map*
$$\sigma^P_{\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(M)} : \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(M)) \to \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(M)$$
is an isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}(A)$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{b} = \mathbf{b} \cdot B^0$, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ be the ideal in $\mathrm{H}^0(B)$ generated by the image of $\mathfrak{b}$. It is clear that the equivalence of categories
$$\mathrm{R}f_* : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$$
restricts to an equivalence of categories
$$\mathrm{R}f_* : \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A) \to \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}-\mathrm{tor}}(B)$$
with a quasi-inverse
$$\mathrm{L}f^* : \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}-\mathrm{tor}}(B) \to \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A).$$
It follows that in order to prove (1), (2), we may assume without loss of generality that $A = B$. Under this assumption, let us set $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$. Let $M \in \mathsf{D}(A)$, and let $M \xrightarrow{\simeq} I$ be a K-injective resolution over A. Then
$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(M) = \Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(I).$$
It follows that for all n, the A^0-module $\mathrm{H}^n(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(I))$ is $\mathfrak{a}$-torsion. But the A^0-action on $\mathrm{H}^n(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(I))$ factors through $\bar{A}$, and $\mathfrak{a} \cdot \bar{A} = \bar{\mathfrak{a}}$, so we deduce that
$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(M) \in \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A).$$
This proves (1). Now, let $N \in \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)$, and let $N \xrightarrow{\simeq} I$ be a K-injective resolution over A. Note that
$$\mathrm{Rest}_{A/A^0}(I) \in \mathsf{D}_{\mathfrak{a}-\mathrm{tor}}(A^0).$$
It follows from [15, Corollary 4.32] that the natural A^0-linear map
$$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathrm{Rest}_{A/A^0}(I)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rest}_{A/A^0}(I)$$
is a quasi-isomorphism, so the A-linear map $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(I) \hookrightarrow I$ is also a quasi-isomorphism, and this implies that σ_N^P is an isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}(A)$. This establishes (2). Now (3) clearly follows from (1), (2). □

Dually to the above, there is a natural map $\tau_M^P : M \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}^P(M)$. We denote by $\mathsf{D}(A)^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}\text{-com}}$ the full subcategory of $\mathsf{D}(A)$ on which τ_M^P is an isomorphism. The next result is proven similarly to Proposition 2.10.

Proposition 2.11. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Then for any $M \in \mathsf{D}(A)$, we have that*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M) \in \mathsf{D}(A)^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}\text{-com}}.$$

The next result generalizes the Greenlees-May duality:

Proposition 2.12. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Then for any $M, N \in \mathsf{D}(A)$, there are bifunctorial isomorphisms*

$$\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), N) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(M, \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N)) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N)).$$

in $\mathsf{D}(A)$.

Proof. Let $M' = \mathrm{R}f_*(M)$, and let $N' = \mathrm{R}f_*(N)$, and let $\mathfrak{b} := \mathbf{b} \cdot B^0$. By definition, we have that

$$\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), N) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(\mathrm{L}f^*(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(M')), \mathrm{L}f^*(N'))$$

By [25, Proposition 2.5], there is a bifunctorial isomorphism

$$\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(\mathrm{L}f^*(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(M')), \mathrm{L}f^*(N')) \cong \mathrm{L}f^*\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(M'), N').$$

Using Proposition 2.4, we have that

$$\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(M'), N') \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(\operatorname{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} M', N'),$$

and using adjunction and Proposition 2.4 again, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(\operatorname{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}) \otimes_{B^0} M', N') \cong \\ \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(M', \operatorname{Hom}_{B^0}(\operatorname{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}), N')) \cong \\ \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(M', \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(N')). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this chain of natural isomorphisms with an application of [25, Proposition 2.5] again, we see that

$$\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), N) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(M, \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N)).$$

For the second claim, note that by Proposition 2.7, we have that

$$\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(M', \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(N')) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(M', \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(N'))).$$

Using Proposition 2.4 and adjunction, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(M', \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(N'))) \cong \\ \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(M', \operatorname{Hom}_{B^0}(\operatorname{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}), \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(N'))) \cong \\ \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(M' \otimes_{B^0} \operatorname{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b}), \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(N')) \cong \\ \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_B(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(M'), \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(N')). \end{aligned}$$

so the second result also follows from an application of [25, Proposition 2.5]. □

Using Proposition 2.10(1), we see that $\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$ defines a functor

$$\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A).$$

Here is the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.13. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal.*

(1) *For any weakly proregular resolution $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, the functor*

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A).$$

is right adjoint to the inclusion functor $\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathsf{D}(A)$.

(2) *For any weakly proregular resolution $P = (f, B, \mathfrak{b})$ of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, the functor*

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$$

is left adjoint to the functor

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$$

Proof. Denote by $F(-)$ the inclusion functor $\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathsf{D}(A)$. Let $M \in \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)$, and let $N \in \mathsf{D}(A)$. By Proposition 2.10(2), we have a natural isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(F(M), N) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), N) = \mathrm{H}^0\mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), N),$$

and by Proposition 2.12, there is a natural isomorphism

$$\mathrm{H}^0\mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), N) \cong \mathrm{H}^0\mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N)).$$

Using Proposition 2.10(2) again, we see that there is a natural isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{H}^0\left(\mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N))\right) \cong \\ \mathrm{H}^0\left(\mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N))\right) = \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(M, \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N)).\end{aligned}$$

Since $M, \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N) \in \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)$, and since $\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)$ is a full subcategory of $\mathsf{D}(A)$, we have that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(M, \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N)) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)}(M, \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N)).$$

Thus, we see that there is a natural isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(F(M), N) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)}(M, \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N)),$$

and this proves (1). The second statement follows immediately from Proposition 2.12. □

Corollary 2.14. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal. Let P, Q be weakly proregular resolutions of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$.*

(1) *Let*

$$\varphi^P : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(M, N) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)}(M, \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N))$$

and

$$\varphi^Q : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(M, N) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)}(M, \mathrm{R}\Gamma^Q_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N))$$

be the adjunctions constructed in Theorem 2.13(1).
Then there is ***a unique isomorphism of functors*** $\alpha_{P,Q} : \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{R}\Gamma^Q_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$ *such that*

$$\varphi^Q = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(1, \alpha_{P,Q}) \circ \varphi^P.$$

(2) *Let*

$$\psi^P : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), N) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(M, \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N))$$

and

$$\psi^Q : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^Q_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M), N) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(M, \mathrm{L}\Lambda^Q_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(N))$$

be be the adjunctions constructed in Theorem 2.13(2).
Then there is ***a unique isomorphism of functors*** $\beta_{P,Q} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{L}\Lambda^Q_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$ *such that*

$$\psi^Q = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(1, \beta_{P,Q}) \circ \psi^P \circ \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}(A)}(\alpha_{P,Q}, 1).$$

Proof. Both statements follow from Theorem 2.13 and the uniqueness of adjoint functors ([10, Theorem 3.2]). □

Remark 2.15. Let A be a commutative DG-ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be a finitely generated ideal. By Proposition 2.2, any such pair $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ has a weakly proregular resolution. We associate to $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ functors

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$$

defined by choosing some weakly proregular resolution P of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, and declaring

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} := \mathrm{R}\Gamma^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \quad \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} := \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}.$$

By Corollary 2.14 up to a unique natural isomorphism respecting the structure, these are independent of the chosen weakly proregular resolution, so this notation makes sense. Similarly, we let

$$\mathsf{D}(A)_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}\text{-com}} := \mathsf{D}(A)^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}\text{-com}}.$$

It follows from the above result that the inclusion $\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathsf{D}(A)$ is a Bousfield localization in the sense of [12, Section 4.9]

Corollary 2.16. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}, \bar{\mathfrak{b}} \subseteq \bar{A}$ be finitely generated ideals such that $\sqrt{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} = \sqrt{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}$. Then there are isomorphisms*

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(-)$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(-)$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$.

Proof. The second claim follows from the first, and the first claim follows from the fact that

$$\mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A) = \mathsf{D}_{\sqrt{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A) = \mathsf{D}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}-\mathrm{tor}}(A)$$

since a $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$-module is $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-torsion if and only if it is $\sqrt{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$-torsion. □

Proposition 2.17. *Let $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ be a map in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(f^\flat(-)) \cong f^\flat(\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-))$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$.

Proof. Choose weakly proregular resolutions $P = (g, P_A, \mathbf{a})$ and $Q = (h, Q, \mathbf{b})$ of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ and $(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ respectively, such that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ {\scriptstyle g}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle h} \\ P & \xrightarrow[\alpha]{} & Q \end{array}$$

in CDG, and such that $\alpha(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{b}$. Then, by definition, we have:

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(f^\flat(M)) = \mathrm{L}\Lambda^Q_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(\mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_A(B, M)) \cong \mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_Q(B, \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{(\mathbf{b})}(\mathrm{R}h_*(\mathrm{R}\,\mathrm{Hom}_A(B, M)))$$

Note that

$$\mathrm{R}h_*(\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(B,M)) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_P(Q,M),$$

and that

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{(\mathbf{b})}(\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_P(Q,M)) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{Q^0}(\operatorname{Tel}(Q^0;\mathbf{b}),\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_P(Q,M)).$$

Since there is an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Tel}(Q^0;\mathbf{b}) \cong \operatorname{Tel}(P^0;\mathbf{a}) \otimes_{P^0} Q^0,$$

using adjunction we have a natural isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Hom}_{Q^0}(\operatorname{Tel}(Q^0;\mathbf{b}),\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_P(Q,M)) \cong \\ \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_P(Q,\operatorname{Hom}_{P^0}(\operatorname{Tel}(P^0;\mathbf{a}),M)) \cong \\ \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_P(Q,\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{(\mathbf{a})}(M)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(f^\flat(M)) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_Q(B,\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_P(Q,\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{(\mathbf{a})}(M))) \cong \\ \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_P(B,\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{(\mathbf{a})}(M)) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(B,\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M)).\end{aligned}$$

□

3. Derived completion of commutative DG-rings and adic maps

In this section we perform the main construction of this paper: a non linear derived adic completion functor. We shall freely use the homotopical methods introduced in Section 1. In preparation for proving Theorem 3.19, the main result of this section, we first gather some preliminary results.

Proposition 3.1. *Let C be a category, let $F : I \to \mathsf{C}$ be a directed system in C, and suppose that for each morphism $i \to j$ in I, the morphism $F(i) \to F(j)$ in C is an isomorphism. Then the direct limit $\varinjlim F \in \mathsf{C}$ exists, and the maps $F(i) \to \varinjlim F$ are isomorphisms for all $i \in I$.*

Proof. Choose some $i_0 \in I$, and let $X = F(i_0)$. For any $i \in I$, select some $j \in I$, such that there are maps $f : i \to j$ and $g : i_0 \to j$. Define a map $\phi_i : F(i) \to X$ by setting $\phi_i := F(g)^{-1} \circ F(f)$. Then ϕ_i is an isomorphism for all i, and it is easy to see that $(X, \{\phi_i\}_{i\in I})$ is the colimit of this system. □

Remark 3.2. Let A be a commutative ring, let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$ be a finitely generated ideal, let B be a commutative DG-ring, and let $A \to B$ be a map of DG-rings. For every n, the tensor product

$$A/\mathfrak{a}^n \otimes_A B$$

is a commutative DG-ring, and moreover, these form an inverse system of commutative DG-rings. Hence, the inverse limit

$$\varprojlim A/\mathfrak{a}^n \otimes_A B$$

which is simply $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(B)$, is also a commutative DG-ring. If C is another commutative DG-ring, and $B \to C$ is an A-linear map, the fact that the maps

$$A/\mathfrak{a}^n \otimes_A B \to A/\mathfrak{a}^n \otimes_A C$$

are maps of commutative DG-rings implies that the map $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(B) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(C)$ is also a map of commutative DG-rings.

Remark 3.3. Given a commutative ring A, and given finitely generated ideals $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{b} \subseteq A$, note that there is a morphism of functors

$$\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}} : \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(-)$$

which is induced by the maps $A/\mathfrak{a}^n \to A/\mathfrak{b}^n$. If moreover $\mathfrak{c}$ is another finitely generated ideal, and $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{c}$, then there is an equality $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{c}} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{c}} \circ \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}}$.

Remark 3.4. Let A be a commutative ring, let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{b} \subseteq A$ be finitely generated ideals, and let $M \in \mathrm{DGMod}(A)$. Applying the functor $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}$ to the natural map $M \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$ we obtain a map

$$\phi : \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(M) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)),$$

which, since $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$, is an isomorphism. On the other hand, applying the natural transformation $1_A \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(-)$ to the object $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$, we obtain a map

$$\psi : \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)).$$

Using Remark 3.3, one obtains a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) & \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}}} & \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(M) \\ {\scriptstyle\psi}\downarrow & \swarrow{\scriptstyle\phi} & \\ \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)) & & \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{DGMod}(A)$, and it is easy to verify that it is commutative.

Remark 3.5. Let $f : A \to B$ be a map of commutative rings, Let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$ be an ideal, and let $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq B$ be the ideal generated by $f(\mathfrak{a})$. Let $Q_f : \mathrm{DGMod}\, B \to \mathrm{DGMod}\, A$ be the forgetful functor. Then the two functors

$$Q_f \circ \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}} : \mathrm{DGMod}(B) \to \mathrm{DGMod}(A)$$

and

$$\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}} \circ Q_f : \mathrm{DGMod}(B) \to \mathrm{DGMod}(A)$$

are equal.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $f : (A, \mathbf{a}) \to (B, \mathbf{b})$ be a quasi-isomorphism between two weakly proregular DG-rings, such that $f(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{b}$. Let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A^0$ be the ideal generated by $\mathbf{a}$, and let $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq B^0$ be the ideal generated by $\mathbf{b}$. Then the map $\Lambda(f) : \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B)$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. By [15, Definition 5.16], there is a commutative diagram in $\mathrm{DGMod}(A^0)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{A^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(A^0;\mathbf{a}), A) & \longrightarrow & \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{A^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(A^0;\mathbf{a}), B) & \xrightarrow[\alpha]{} & \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(B) = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B) \end{array}$$

Moreover, since A is K-flat over A^0, by [15, Corollary 5.23], the top horizontal map is a quasi-isomorphism. Since $A \to B$ is a quasi-isomorphism, and since $\mathrm{Tel}(A^0;\mathbf{a})$ is K-projective over A^0, the left vertical map is a quasi-isomorphism. Similarly, there is a quasi-isomorphism

$$\beta : \mathrm{Hom}_{B^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(B^0;\mathbf{b}), B) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B)$$

in $\mathrm{DGMod}(B^0)$. Letting $\mathrm{Rest}_{f^0} : \mathrm{DGMod}(B^0) \to \mathrm{DGMod}(A^0)$ be the forgetful functor along the map $f^0 : A^0 \to B^0$, the fact that $\mathrm{Tel}(A^0; \mathbf{a}) \otimes_{A^0} B^0 = \mathrm{Tel}(B^0; \mathbf{b})$ and the construction of β in [15], implies that $\mathrm{Rest}_{f^0}(\beta) = \alpha$, so that α is also a quasi-isomorphism. Hence, $\Lambda(f)$ is a quasi-isomorphism. □

In the remaining of this section, we will use the following notations.

Notation 3.7. Fix a commutative noetherian ring $\Bbbk$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^0$, let

$$\mathsf{CDG}_n := \mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk[x_1,\ldots,x_n]} .$$

In particular, $\mathsf{CDG} := \mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk} = \mathsf{CDG}_0$. We say that $A \in \mathsf{CDG}_n$ is a semi-free object if the structure map $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \to A$ is semi-free. If $n < m$, there is an inclusion map

$$\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \hookrightarrow \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n, \ldots, x_m]$$

which is semi-free, and it induces a forgetful functor $\mathsf{CDG}_m \to \mathsf{CDG}_n$, which we will denote by

$$G^m_n : \mathsf{CDG}_m \to \mathsf{CDG}_n,$$

or, if $n = 0$, simply by

$$G^m : \mathsf{CDG}_m \to \mathsf{CDG} .$$

If $n < m < k$, it is clear that there is an **equality**

$$G^m_n \circ G^k_m(-) = G^k_n(-) \tag{3.8}$$

of functors $\mathsf{CDG}_k \to \mathsf{CDG}_n$. Notice that an element $A \in \mathsf{CDG}_n$ is the same as an element $A \in \mathsf{CDG}$, together with a choice of n elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A^0$ (the images of $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in A).

If $0 < n \leq m$, and $A \in \mathsf{CDG}_m$, we may form the $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$-adic completion of A, and thus obtain a functor

$$\Lambda^m_n : \mathsf{CDG}_m \to \mathsf{CDG}_m .$$

According to Remark 3.5, if $n \leq m \leq k$, there is an **equality**

$$G^k_m \circ \Lambda^k_n(-) = \Lambda^m_n(G^k_m(-)) \tag{3.9}$$

of functors $\mathsf{CDG}_k \to \mathsf{CDG}_m$.

Given $0 < n < m \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$, the fact that $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \subseteq (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ implies by Remark 3.3 that there is a natural transformation $\Lambda^k_{n,m} : \Lambda^k_n(-) \to \Lambda^k_m(-)$. Also from that remark, we see that if $m \leq j \leq k$, then there is an **equality**

$$\Lambda^k_{m,j} \circ \Lambda^k_{n,m} = \Lambda^k_{n,j}$$

of natural transformations $\Lambda^k_n \to \Lambda^k_j$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $C \in \mathsf{CDG}_m$ be a semi-free object, and let*

$$\alpha : \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_m] \to C$$

be the structure map. Given $n \leq m$, let $\mathbf{a} := (\alpha(x_1), \ldots, \alpha(x_n))$. Then the pair $(C, \mathbf{a})$ is a weakly proregular DG-ring.

Proof. By definition, α is semi-free, so in particular the map of commutative rings

$$\alpha^0 : \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_m] \to C^0$$

is flat. Since $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ is noetherian, the sequence

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$$

is weakly proregular, so $\mathbf{a} \in C^0$ is weakly proregular. Semi-freeness of α also implies that there is some graded set of variables X, such that there is an isomorphism of graded algebras

$$C \cong \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_m] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[X].$$

Writing $X = X^{<0} \cup X^0$, where X^0 is the subset of X made of its variables of grade 0, since $\mathbb{Z}[X] \cong \mathbb{Z}[X^0] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[X^{<0}]$, we deduce that there are isomorphisms of graded algebras

$$C^0 \cong \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_m] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[X^0]$$

and

$$C \cong C^0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[X^{<0}].$$

Hence, we see that C is K-flat over C^0, so that the pair $(C, \mathbf{a})$ is a weakly proregular commutative DG-ring. □

Lemma 3.11. *Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $C_1, C_2 \in \mathsf{CDG}_m$ be two semi-free objects, and let $f : C_1 \to C_2$ be a quasi-isomorphism in CDG_m. Then for any $0 < n \leq m$, the morphism*

$$\Lambda_n^m(f) : \Lambda_n^m(C_1) \to \Lambda_n^m(C_2)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism.

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.10. □

Lemma 3.12. *Let $0 < n \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $X, Y \in \mathsf{CDG}_m$, with X semi-free, and let $f, g : X \to Y$ be two morphisms in CDG_m. If f and g are left homotopic, then the maps*

$$\Lambda_n^m(f), \Lambda_n^m(g) : \Lambda_n^m(X) \to \Lambda_n^m(Y)$$

in CDG_m are left homotopic, and for any $0 \leq l < m$, the maps

$$G_l^m(\Lambda_n^m(f)), G_l^m(\Lambda_n^m(g)) : G_l^m(\Lambda_n^m(X)) \to G_l^m(\Lambda_n^m(Y))$$

in CDG_l are left homotopic.

Proof. By Lemma 3.11, the functor $\Lambda_n^m : \mathsf{CDG}_m \to \mathsf{CDG}_m$ takes quasi-isomorphisms between semi-free objects into quasi-isomorphisms, and clearly the same is true for $G_l^m \circ \Lambda_n^m : \mathsf{CDG}_m \to \mathsf{CDG}_l$. Hence the result follows from Proposition 1.6. □

Lemma 3.13. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ be two finite sequences of elements of A^0, and suppose that $(A, \mathbf{a})$ and $(A, \mathbf{b})$ are weakly proregular DG-rings. Assume that*

$$\sqrt{\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(A)} = \sqrt{\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(A)}.$$

Then for any $M \in \mathrm{DGMod}(A)$, the natural map

$$M \to \mathrm{Hom}_{A^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(A^0; \mathbf{a}), M)$$

in $\mathrm{DGMod}(A)$ is a quasi-isomorphism if and only if the natural map

$$M \to \mathrm{Hom}_{A^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(A^0; \mathbf{b}), M)$$

in $\mathrm{DGMod}(A)$ is a quasi-isomorphism.

Proof. We may apply the forgetful functor $\mathrm{DGMod}(A) \to \mathrm{DGMod}(A^0)$, and it is enough to check this assertion in $\mathrm{DGMod}(A^0)$. Letting $\mathfrak{a} := \mathbf{a} \cdot A^0$, $\mathfrak{b} := \mathbf{b} \cdot A^0$, by [15, Corollary 5.25], the above assertion is equivalent to showing that M is cohomologically $\mathfrak{a}$-adically complete if and only if M is cohomologically $\mathfrak{b}$-adically complete. Since $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}$ are idempotent ([15, Proposition 7.10]), this is equivalent to showing that there is some isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{A^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(A^0; \mathbf{a}), M) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{A^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(A^0; \mathbf{b}), M)$$

in $\mathsf{D}(A^0)$, and this follows from Proposition 2.4 and Corollary 2.16, since $(1_A, A, \mathbf{a})$ is a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(A))$, and $(1_A, A, \mathbf{b})$ is a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(A))$. □

Lemma 3.14. *Let $0 < n < m \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $C \in \mathsf{CDG}_k$ be a semi-free object, and assume that*

$$\sqrt{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(C)} = \sqrt{(x_1, \dots, x_m) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(C)}.$$

Then the morphism

$$\Lambda^k_{n,m} : \Lambda^k_n(C) \to \Lambda^k_m(C)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism.

Proof. According to Remark 3.4, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda^k_n(C) & \xrightarrow{\Lambda^k_{n,m}} & \Lambda^k_m(C) \\ {\scriptstyle\psi}\downarrow & \swarrow{\scriptstyle\phi} & \\ \Lambda^k_m(\Lambda^k_n(C)) & & \end{array}$$

in which ϕ is an isomorphism, so it is enough to show that the map ψ is a quasi-isomorphism. Set $\mathbf{a} := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} := (x_1, \dots, x_m)$, and let $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ be the ideals in $\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ generated by $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ respectively. Let $M := \Lambda^k_n(C)$. Since C is K-flat over $\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_k]$, $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(C) \cong M$, so the fact that $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is idempotent implies that M is cohomologically $\mathfrak{a}$-adically complete. Hence, the canonical map

$$M \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_k]}(\mathrm{Tel}(\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_k]; \mathbf{a}), M) \tag{3.15}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. Letting $\alpha : \Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_k] \to C$ be the structure map, note that (3.15) is obtained by applying the forgetful functor

$$\mathrm{DGMod}(C) \to \mathrm{DGMod}(\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_k])$$

to the map

$$M \to \mathrm{Hom}_{C^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(C^0; \alpha(\mathbf{a})), M). \tag{3.16}$$

Hence, (3.16) is also a quasi-isomorphism. By Lemma 3.13, this implies that the map

$$M \to \mathrm{Hom}_{C^0}(\mathrm{Tel}(C^0; \alpha(\mathbf{b})), M)$$

is a a quasi-isomorphism, and applying the forgetful functor

$$\mathrm{DGMod}(C) \to \mathrm{DGMod}(\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_k]),$$

this implies that the map

$$M \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_k]}(\mathrm{Tel}(\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_k]; \mathbf{b}), M) \tag{3.17}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. By [15, Lemma 5.20], the map (3.17) fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_k]}(\mathrm{Tel}(\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_k]; \mathbf{b}), M) \\ \downarrow & \swarrow & \\ \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(M) & & \end{array} \tag{3.18}$$

Notice that as an object of the noetherian ring $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_k]$, M is the $\mathfrak{a}$-adic completion of a bounded above complex of free A-modules. Hence, M is K-flat over $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_k]$, so by [15, Corollary 5.23], the map

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\Bbbk[x_1,\ldots,x_k]}(\operatorname{Tel}(\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_k]; \mathbf{b}), M) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(M)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. We deduce that the vertical map in (3.18) is also a quasi-isomorphism, but this is exactly the map ψ, so we are done. □

Here is the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.19. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring. There is a functor*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk})$$

and a natural transformation

$$\boldsymbol{\tau} : 1_{\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk})} \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda$$

such that the following properties hold:

(P1) *For any $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$, and any weakly proregular resolution*

$$P = (g, P_A, \mathbf{a})$$

of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, there is an isomorphism $\varphi_P : \widehat{P}_A \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$ making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_A & \xrightarrow{\;g\;} & A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \boldsymbol{\tau}_A} \\ \widehat{P}_A & \xrightarrow[\;\varphi_P\;]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \end{array}$$

commutative.

(P2) *Given a morphism $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$, and weakly proregular resolutions $P = (g, P_A, \mathbf{a})$, $P' = (h, P_B, \mathbf{b})$ of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ and $(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ respectively, for any map $P_f : P_A \to P_B$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ making the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_A & \xrightarrow{\;P_f\;} & P_B \\ {\scriptstyle g}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} \\ A & \xrightarrow[\;f\;]{} & B \end{array}$$

commutative, and such that $P_f(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{b}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{P}_A & \xrightarrow{\;\widehat{P}_f\;} & \widehat{P}_B \\ {\scriptstyle \varphi_P}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_{P'}} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \xrightarrow[\;\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)\;]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$ is commutative.

Proof. In what follows we will shorten notation, and write CDG for $\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk}$ and $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$ for $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$. Let $Q : \mathsf{CDG} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ be the localization functor.

3.20. For any $(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, let $\operatorname{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ be the set of finite multisets of elements of A^0 whose image in $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ generates $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$. Thus, an element of $\operatorname{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ is a finite set of elements of A^0, where we allow (finite) repetitions, but order does not matter. The inclusion relation on multisets makes $\operatorname{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ into a partially ordered set. Moreover, it is clear that this partially ordered set is a directed set. If $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \operatorname{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, and $\mathbf{y}$ contains $\mathbf{x}$, we write $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$. Given $\mathbf{x} \in \operatorname{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, we denote by $|\mathbf{x}|$ its cardinality.

3.21. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \operatorname{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, we now choose some ordering of $\mathbf{x}$, and using it we write $\mathbf{x} = (a_1,\dots,a_n)$. We give A the structure of a DG-ring over $\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ by $x_i \mapsto a_i$. Let us denote this object of CDG_n by $A_{\mathbf{x}}$. Factor the structure map

$$\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n] \to A_{\mathbf{x}}$$

as

$$\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n] \to C_{\mathbf{x}} \xrightarrow{c_{\mathbf{x}}} A_{\mathbf{x}}$$

such that $c_{\mathbf{x}} : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to A_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a surjective quasi-isomorphism in CDG_n, and $\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n] \to C_{\mathbf{x}}$ is semi-free. Set

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) := Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}))) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}),$$

3.22. In the sequel we will sometimes use different orderings of $\mathbf{x}$. Any such an ordering is determined by a permutation σ of $\{x_1,\dots,x_n\}$, and give rise to a different $\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ structure on A, denoted by $A_{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}$. The permutation σ induces an automorphism

$$\mathrm{Aut}_\sigma : \Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n] \to \Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n]$$

given by $x_i \mapsto \sigma(x_i)$. This automorphism is a semi-free map, so we deduce that

$$\mathrm{For}_{\mathrm{Aut}_\sigma}(c_{\mathbf{x}}) : \mathrm{For}_{\mathrm{Aut}_\sigma}(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \to \mathrm{For}_{\mathrm{Aut}_\sigma}(A_{\mathbf{x}})$$

is also a surjective quasi-isomorphism from a semi-free object to A over $\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ with respect to this different ordering of $\mathbf{x}$. Here, we denoted by $\mathrm{For}_{\mathrm{Aut}_\sigma}(c_{\mathbf{x}})$ the forgetful functor $\mathsf{CDG}_n \to \mathsf{CDG}_n$ induced by the map Aut_σ. Since the functor Λ^n_n depends only on the ideal $(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ and not on the order, we deduce that the element $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ does not depend on the choice of the ordering.

3.23. Given $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \operatorname{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ such that $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$, we define an isomorphism

$$\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A)$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ as follows: First, if needed, reorder $\mathbf{y}$ so that $G^m_n(A_{\mathbf{y}}) = A_{\mathbf{x}}$. If $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$, we let $\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ be the identity. Otherwise, let $n = |\mathbf{x}| < m = |\mathbf{y}|$. The inclusion of rings $\Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_n] \hookrightarrow \Bbbk[x_1,\dots,x_m]$ is semi-free, so the map

$$G^m_n(c_{\mathbf{y}}) : G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) \to G^m_n(A_{\mathbf{y}}) = A_{\mathbf{x}}$$

is a surjective quasi-isomorphism from a semi-free object in CDG_n. As both $c_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $G^m_n(c_{\mathbf{y}})$ are surjective quasi-isomorphisms from semi-free objects to $A_{\mathbf{x}}$, it follows by Corollary 1.5(1) that there is a quasi-isomorphism in CDG_n:

$$\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}} : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) \tag{3.24}$$

such that the diagram

(3.25)



is commutative. Applying the functor $G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n : \mathsf{CDG}_n \to \mathsf{CDG}$ to this map, we obtain a map

$$G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}) : G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \to G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})). \tag{3.26}$$

which by Lemma 3.11 is a quasi-isomorphism. By (3.9), we have an equality

$$\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})).$$

Since by (3.8), $G^n \circ G^m_n = G^m$, we see that there is an equality in CDG:

$$G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G^m \circ \Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}). \tag{3.27}$$

By Remark 3.3, there is a morphism

$$\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) \to \Lambda^m_m(C_{\mathbf{y}}), \tag{3.28}$$

in CDG_m, which by Lemma 3.14 is a quasi-isomorphism. Applying the functor G^m to this morphism, we obtain a map

$$G^m \circ \Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) \to G^m \circ \Lambda^m_m(C_{\mathbf{y}}), \tag{3.29}$$

Applying the functor $Q : \mathsf{CDG} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ to the composition of the maps (3.26), (3.27) and (3.29), we obtain a map $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A)$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$, which we denote by $\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$. Since each of these maps is a quasi-isomorphism, we deduce that $\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is an isomorphism.

3.30. Note that in (3.24), we have made a choice of a quasi-isomorphism

$$\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}} : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}).$$

If

$$(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})' : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})$$

is another such a quasi-isomorphism making (3.25) commutative, by Corollay 1.5(1), the maps $\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})'$ are left homotopic, so by Lemma 3.12, the maps $G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ and $G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n((\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})')$ are left homotopic, so there is an equality

$$Q(G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})) = Q(G^n \circ \Lambda^n_n((\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})')).$$

We deduce that the morphism $\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is independent of the choice we made in (3.24).

Claim 1. Given $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{z} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, the maps

$$\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A),$$
$$\psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{z}}(A)$$

and

$$\psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{z}}(A)$$

satisfy the equality $\psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}} \circ \psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$.

Proof Assume that $|\mathbf{x}| = n < |\mathbf{y}| = m < |\mathbf{z}| = k$. First, if needed, reorder $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$ so that $G^k_m(A_{\mathbf{z}}) = A_{\mathbf{y}}$, and $G^m_n(A_{\mathbf{y}}) = A_{\mathbf{x}}$. By the construction, we get three quasi-isomorphisms

$$\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}} : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})$$
$$\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}} : C_{\mathbf{y}} \to G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})$$

and

$$\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}} : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}}).$$

Applying the forgetful functor G^m_n to $\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}$, we obtain a quasi-isomorphism

$$G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}) : G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) \to G^m_n(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})) = G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}}).$$

In general, there might be an inequality

$$\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}} \neq G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}) \circ \phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$$

However, because both $\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}) \circ \phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ are quasi-isomorphisms between semi-free objects making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbf{x}} & \longrightarrow & G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & {\scriptstyle c_{\mathbf{x}}} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle G^k_n(c_{\mathbf{z}})} & \\ & A_{\mathbf{x}} & \end{array}$$

commutative, and $c_{\mathbf{x}}$, $G^k_n(c_{\mathbf{z}})$ are surjective quasi-isomorphisms, by Corollary 1.5(1), they must be left homotopic. By Lemma 3.12, the morphisms

$$\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}})$$

and

$$\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}) \circ \phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})$$

in CDG_n are left homotopic.

Notice that the morphism $\psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}} \circ \psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is obtained by applying the functor $Q \circ G^n$ to the composition

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) &\xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \\ &\xrightarrow{G^m_n(\Lambda^m_{n,m})} G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \xrightarrow{G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}))} G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))) = \\ &G^m_n(G^k_m(\Lambda^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))) = G^k_n(\Lambda^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{G^k_n(\Lambda^k m,k)} G^k_n(\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \end{aligned}$$

of maps in CDG_n. Using Remark 3.3, we see that the two morphisms

$$\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^m_{n,m}} \Lambda^m_m(C_{\mathbf{y}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^m_m(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}})} \Lambda^m_m(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))$$

and

$$\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}})} \Lambda^m_n(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^m_{n,m}} \Lambda^m_m(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))$$

in CDG_m are equal, so that $\psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}} \circ \psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ can also be obtained by applying the functor $Q \circ G^n$ to the composition

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) &\xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \\ &\xrightarrow{G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}))} G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))) \xrightarrow{G^m_n(\Lambda^m_{n,m})} G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))) = \\ &G^m_n(G^k_m(\Lambda^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))) = G^k_n(\Lambda^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{G^k_n(\Lambda^k_{m,k})} G^k_n(\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \end{aligned}$$

By applying (3.9), we see that this composition is equal to the composition

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) &\xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}))} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))) = \Lambda^n_n(G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) = \\ &G^k_n(\Lambda^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{G^k_n(\Lambda^k_{n,m})} G^k_n(\Lambda^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{G^k_n(\Lambda^k_{m,k})} G^k_n(\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \end{aligned}$$

Using functoriality of Λ^n_n and the fact that $\Lambda^k_{n,k} = \Lambda^k_{m,k} \circ \Lambda^k_{n,m}$, this is the same as the composition

$$\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}) \circ \phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})} \Lambda^n_n(G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) = G^k_n(\Lambda^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{G^k_n(\Lambda^k_{n,k})} G^k_n(\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})). \tag{3.31}$$

On the other hand, the morphism $\psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is equal to the image of the functor $Q \circ G^n$ under the composition

$$\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}})} \Lambda^n_n(G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) = G^k_n(\Lambda^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{G^k_n(\Lambda^k_{n,k})} G^k_n(\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})). \tag{3.32}$$

But we have seen that $\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ and $\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}}) \circ \phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ are left homotopic, and by Proposition 1.2, the functor $Q \circ G^n : \mathsf{CDG}_n \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ takes left homotopies into equalities, so we deduce that the applications of the functor $Q \circ G^n : \mathsf{CDG}_n \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ to the compositions of (3.31) and (3.32) are equal, proving that $\psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \psi^{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{y}} \circ \psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$. ∎

3.33. Given a map $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, and given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, since the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^0 & \xrightarrow{f^0} & B^0 \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_A}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_B} \\ \mathrm{H}^0(A) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{H}^0(f)]{} & \mathrm{H}^0(B) \end{array}$$

commutes, we deduce that $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathrm{Gen}(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, where we have let $f(\mathbf{x})$ be the multiset obtained by applying f to each member of $\mathbf{x}$. Moreover, it is clear that if $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$ then $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{y})$.

3.34. Given a map $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, and given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, we now define a morphism $\chi^f_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B)$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ as follows: Let $n = |\mathbf{x}| = |f(\mathbf{x})|$. Note that the map $f : A \to B$ induces a map $A_{\mathbf{x}} \to B_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ in CDG_n, which we also denote by f. Since $c_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $c_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ are surjective quasi-isomorphisms from semi-free objects to $A_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $B_{f(\mathbf{x})}$, by Corollary 1.5(2), there is a map $\alpha : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ in CDG_n, making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & C_{f(\mathbf{x})} \\ {\scriptstyle c_{\mathbf{x}}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c_{f(\mathbf{x})}} \\ A_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B_{f(\mathbf{x})} \end{array} \tag{3.35}$$

commutative, and this induces a map

$$\chi^f_{\mathbf{x}} := Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\alpha))) : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B)$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$, which is the required map $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B)$.

3.36. If $\alpha' : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ is another map making (3.35) commutative, then by Corollary 1.5(2), the maps α and α' are left homotopic. By Lemma 3.12, this implies that

$$Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\alpha))) = Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\alpha'))), \tag{3.37}$$

so that the map $\chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$ is independent of the choice of α. Furthermore, note that if f is a quasi-isomorphism, then any such α is a quasi-isomorphism, so by Lemma 3.11, $\Lambda^n_n(\alpha)$ is also a quasi-isomorphism, which implies that $\chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$ is an isomorphism.

Claim 2. Given a map $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, and given $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ the diagram

(3.38)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi^{f(\mathbf{y})}_{f(\mathbf{x})}} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A) & \xrightarrow[\chi^f_{\mathbf{y}}]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{y})}(B) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ is commutative.

Proof Choose some map $\alpha : C_{\mathbf{y}} \to C_{f(\mathbf{y})}$ in CDG_m, such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbf{y}} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & C_{f(\mathbf{y})} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle c_{\mathbf{y}}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c_{f(\mathbf{y})}} \\ A_{\mathbf{y}} & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B_{f(\mathbf{y})} \end{array}$$

is commutative. Applying the functor G^m_n to this diagram, we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A_{\mathbf{x}} & \longrightarrow & B_{f(\mathbf{x})} \end{array}$$

in CDG_n, in which the vertical maps are surjective quasi-isomorphisms, where we have set $\beta := G^m_n(\alpha)$. Using Corollary 1.5(1), choose quasi-isomorphisms $g : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})$, $h : C_{f(\mathbf{x})} \to G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})$ and $h' : G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})}) \to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ such that $G^m_n(c_{\mathbf{y}}) \circ g = c_{\mathbf{x}}$, such that $G^m_n(c_{f(\mathbf{y})}) \circ h = c_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ and such that $c_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ h' = G^m_n(c_{f(\mathbf{y})})$. By uniqueness in Corollary 1.5(1), the maps $h \circ h'$ and $1_{G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})}$ are left homotopic.

Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbf{x}} & & C_{f(\mathbf{x})} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} \\ G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})}) \end{array}$$

We do not know if there is a map $C_{\mathbf{x}} \to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ making this diagram commutative. However, this is true up to homotopy. Let $\gamma := h' \circ \beta \circ g : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$.

By definition, the composition $\chi^f_{\mathbf{y}} \circ \psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is obtained by applying the functor $Q \circ G^n$ to the composition of maps

(3.39)
$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \to \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) &\xrightarrow{G^m_n(\Lambda^m_{n,m})} \\ G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) &\xrightarrow{G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(\alpha))} G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \end{aligned}$$

in CDG_n.

To compute the map $\chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$, recall that by (3.37) we may use any map $C_{\mathbf{x}} \to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ which makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbf{x}} & \longrightarrow & C_{f(\mathbf{x})} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A_{\mathbf{x}} & \longrightarrow & B_{f(\mathbf{x})} \end{array}$$

commutative, and note that $\gamma : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ is such a map. Hence, the composition $\psi^{f(\mathbf{y})}_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ \chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$ can be obtained by applying $Q \circ G^n$ to the composition of maps

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\gamma)} \Lambda^n_n(C_{f(\mathbf{x})}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(h)} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \\ = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \to G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \end{aligned}$$

Since $h \circ \gamma = (h \circ h') \circ (\beta \circ g)$, this is the same as the composition

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(g)} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\beta)} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(h\circ h')} \\ \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \to G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \end{aligned}$$

Since the functor Λ^n_n takes left homotopies from semi-free objects to left homotopies (Lemma 3.12), we see that $Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(h \circ h'))) = Q(G^n(1_{G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})}))$. Since $Q \circ G^n$ is a functor, we deduce that $\psi^{f(\mathbf{y})}_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ \chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$ is equal to the application of $Q \circ G^n$ to the composition

$$\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(g)} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\beta)} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \to G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{f(\mathbf{y})}))$$

which, by using (3.9), is the same as

$$\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(g)} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \xrightarrow{G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(\alpha))} G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{f(\mathbf{y})})) \to G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{f(\mathbf{y})}))$$

By Remark 3.3, this is equal to

$$\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(g)} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \to G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \to G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{f(\mathbf{y})}))$$

which is exactly (3.39), so we deduce that (3.38) commutes. ∎

Claim 3. Given maps $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ and $g : (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \to (D, \bar{\mathfrak{d}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, and given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, there is an equality

$$\chi^{g\circ f}_{\mathbf{x}} = \chi^g_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ \chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$.

Proof Assume $|x| = n$. We may choose maps $\alpha : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ and $\beta : C_{f(\mathbf{x})} \to C_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}$ making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} C_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & C_{f(\mathbf{x})} & \xrightarrow{\beta} & C_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))} \\ {\scriptstyle c_{\mathbf{x}}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c_{f(\mathbf{x})}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}} \\ A_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B_{f(\mathbf{x})} & \xrightarrow[g]{} & D_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))} \end{array}$$

commutative, so in particular the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow{\beta\circ\alpha} & C_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))} \\ {\scriptstyle c_{\mathbf{x}}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}} \\ A_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow[g\circ f]{} & D_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))} \end{array}$$

is also commutative. According to (3.37), this implies that

$$\chi^{g\circ f}_{\mathbf{x}} = Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\beta\circ\alpha)))$$

so that

$$\chi^{g\circ f}_{\mathbf{x}} = Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\beta\circ\alpha))) = Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\beta))) \circ Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\alpha))) = \chi^g_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ \chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$$

which proves the claim. ∎

3.40. Define a directed system $F(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ indexed by $\mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, as follows:

(1) For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, we let $F(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})(\mathbf{x})$ be the object $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ defined in (3.21).
(2) Given $\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, we let

$$F(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})(\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{y}) : F(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})(\mathbf{x}) \to F(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})(\mathbf{y})$$

to be the isomorphism $\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ defined in (3.23).

By Claim 1, this is a directed system, and by Proposition 3.1, the direct limit $\varinjlim F(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ exists, and for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, there is an isomorphism

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \varinjlim F(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}). \tag{3.41}$$

(Note that this is a colimit in the homotopy category, and not a homotopy colimit). We denote this direct limit by $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$.

3.42. Given a map $f : (A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, by (3.34), there is a morphism $\chi^f_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B)$. Composing it with the isomorphism $\alpha_{f(\mathbf{x})} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, we obtain a map $\beta_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$.

Claim 4. Given a map $f : (A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, and elements $\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A) \\ & {\scriptstyle\beta_{\mathbf{x}}}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle\beta_{\mathbf{y}}} & \\ & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}}) & \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ is commutative.

Proof By Claim 2 and the fact that $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ is a colimit of a diagram in which $\psi^{f(\mathbf{y})}_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ is a transition map, there is a commutative diagram



By definition, we have that $\beta_{\mathbf{x}} = \alpha_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ \chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$, and $\beta_{\mathbf{y}} = \alpha_{f(\mathbf{y})} \circ \chi^f_{\mathbf{y}}$, so we are done. ∎

3.43. Given a map $f : (A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, by the universal property of direct limits, Claim 4 implies that there is a unique map

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f) : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$$

such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, the diagram

(3.44)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \\ {\scriptstyle \chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{f(\mathbf{x})}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \end{array}$$

is commutative.

3.45. Given a quasi-isomorphism $f : (A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, by (3.36), for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, the map $\chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}$ is an isomorphism. Since the horizontal maps of (3.44) are isomorphisms, we deduce that in this case the map

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f) : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$$

is an isomorphism.

Claim 5. Let $f : (A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ and $g : (B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \to (D,\bar{\mathfrak{d}})$ be maps in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$. Then there is an equality

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g \circ f) = \mathrm{L}\Lambda(g) \circ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$.

Proof According to (3.44), there are commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \\ {\scriptstyle \chi^f_{\mathbf{x}}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{f(\mathbf{x})}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \\ {\scriptstyle \chi^g_{f(\mathbf{x})}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{L}\Lambda(g)} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}(C) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(C,\bar{\mathfrak{c}}) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \chi_{\mathbf{x}}^{g\circ f}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{L}\Lambda(g\circ f)} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}(C) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(C,\bar{\mathfrak{c}}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$. Since all horizontal maps in these diagrams are invertible, the first diagram implies that

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g)\circ\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f) = \alpha_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}\circ\chi^{g}_{f(\mathbf{x})}\circ\chi^{f}_{\mathbf{x}}\circ(\alpha_{\mathbf{x}})^{-1}$$

and the second diagram implies that

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g\circ f) = \alpha_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}\circ\chi^{g\circ f}_{\mathbf{x}}\circ(\alpha_{\mathbf{x}})^{-1}.$$

According to Claim 3, there is an equality $\chi^{g\circ f}_{\mathbf{x}} = \chi^{g}_{f(\mathbf{x})}\circ\chi^{f}_{\mathbf{x}}$, so we deduce that

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g)\circ\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f) = \mathrm{L}\Lambda(g\circ f)$$

proving the claim. ∎

We now complete the construction of the functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda$ and the natural transformation $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. Given $(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})\in\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, and $\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, denote by $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ the completion map

$$\tau_{\mathbf{x}} : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to \Lambda^{n}_{n}(C_{\mathbf{x}}).$$

Let $\mathbf{A}$ be the directed system in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ indexed by $\mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, such that all of its objects are equal to A, and all its morphisms are equal to 1_A. Define a morphism of directed systems $\mathbf{A}\to F(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ by letting for each $\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ the map $A\to\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A)$ to be the composition

$$A \xrightarrow{Q(G^n(c_{\mathbf{x}}))^{-1}} Q(G^n(C_{\mathbf{x}})) \xrightarrow{Q(G^n(\tau_{\mathbf{x}}))} Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}))) = \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A).$$

If $\mathbf{x}\le\mathbf{y}\in\mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, by the definition of $\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}$, it is clear that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{1_A} & A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow[\psi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}}]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A) \end{array}$$

is commutative, so this is indeed a morphism of directed systems. Similarly, if $f : (A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})\to(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ is a morphism in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, the definition of $\chi^{f}_{\mathbf{x}}$ makes it clear that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\chi^{f}_{\mathbf{x}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B) \end{array} \tag{3.46}$$

is commutative. Passing to the limit, we obtain a morphism $\tau_A : A\to\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$.

Now, given $(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})\in\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, we give $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ the structure of an element of $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$ by declaring

$$\mathrm{H}^0(\tau_A)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}})\cdot\mathrm{H}^0(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})) \tag{3.47}$$

to be its ideal of definition. Given $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, commutativity of (3.46) implies that $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)$ defines a morphism

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f) : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}),$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$, and Claim 5 implies that $\mathrm{L}\Lambda$ is a functorial. Thus, we have defined a functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$. We have seen in (3.45) that it takes quasi-isomorphisms to isomorphisms, so we get an induced functor

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}).$$

The definition (3.47) implies immediately that the morphisms τ_A give rise to a natural transformation

$$\boldsymbol{\tau} : 1_{\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})} \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda.$$

With the construction finished, it remains to verify that $\mathrm{L}\Lambda, \boldsymbol{\tau}$ satisfy conditions (P1),(P2) of the theorem.

Claim 6. The functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda$ and the natural transformation $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ constructed above satisfy (P1).

Proof Let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$, and let $P = (g, P_A, \mathbf{a})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Assume $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, and let

$$\mathbf{x} := (g(a_1), \ldots, g(a_n)) \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}).$$

Then we may regard P_A as an object of CDG_n, and the map g induces a map $P_A \to A_{\mathbf{x}}$, which we also denote by g. Let $\beta : C_P \to P_A$ be a surjective quasi-isomorphism in CDG_n, with C_P being semi-free over $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Then there is a map $\alpha : C_P \to C_{\mathbf{x}}$ in CDG_n making the diagram

(3.48)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_{\mathbf{x}} & \longleftarrow & C_{\mathbf{x}} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} \\ P_A & \underset{\beta}{\longleftarrow} & C_P \end{array}$$

commutative. As the horizontal maps and left vertical map are quasi-isomorphisms, we deduce that α is also a quasi-isomorphism. Applying the functor Λ^n_n to this diagram, and using the natural transformation $1_{\mathsf{CDG}_n} \to \Lambda^n_n$, one obtains a commutative diagram

(3.49)
$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A_{\mathbf{x}} & \longleftarrow & C_{\mathbf{x}} & \longrightarrow & \Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \Lambda^n_n(\alpha)} \\ P_A & \underset{\beta}{\longleftarrow} & C_P & \longrightarrow & \Lambda^n_n(C_P) \\ \downarrow & & & \searrow^{\Lambda^n_n(\beta)} & \\ \Lambda^n_n(P_A) & & & & \end{array}$$

The map $\Lambda^n_n(\alpha)$ is a quasi-isomorphism by Lemma 3.11, and similarly, the map $\Lambda^n_n(\beta)$ is a quasi-isomorphism by Lemma 3.6. Let $\varphi_P : \widehat{P}_A \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ be the composition

$$\widehat{P}_A = Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(P_A))) \xrightarrow{Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\beta)))^{-1}} Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(C_P))) \xrightarrow{Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\alpha)))} Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}})))$$

together with the isomorphism $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}} : Q(G^n(\Lambda_n^n(C_{\mathbf{x}}))) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ from (3.41). Then φ_P is an isomorphism, and (3.49) shows that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_A & \xrightarrow{g} & A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \boldsymbol{\tau}_A} \\ \widehat{P}_A & \xrightarrow[\varphi_P]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \end{array}$$

is commutative, establishing (P1). ∎

3.50. Before proving (P2), notice first that in Claim 6 we have actually proved more: by functoriality of $\mathrm{L}\Lambda$, the map $g : P_A \to A$ induces a map

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g) : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_A, \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(P_A)) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}).$$

To compute $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_A, \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathrm{H}^0(P_A))$, we may use $\mathbf{a} \in \mathrm{Gen}(P_A, \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathrm{H}^0(P_A))$, and so we deduce that there is an isomorphism

$$Q(G^n(\Lambda_n^n(C_P))) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_A, \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(P_A)).$$

Moreover, the commutative diagrams (3.48) and (3.44) imply that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q(G^n(\Lambda_n^n(C_P))) & \longrightarrow & Q(G^n(\Lambda_n^n(C_{\mathbf{x}}))) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_A, \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(P_A)) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \end{array}$$

is commutative, so we deduce that the map

$$\varphi_P : \widehat{P}_A \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$$

factors through $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g)$, and is equal to the composition

$$\widehat{P}_A \xrightarrow{Q(G^n(\Lambda_n^n(\beta)))^{-1}} Q(G^n(\Lambda_n^n(C_P))) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_A, \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathrm{H}^0(P_A)) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g)} \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}). \tag{3.51}$$

Claim 7. The functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda$ and the natural transformation $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ constructed above satisfy (P2).

Proof Let $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ be a map in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, let $P = (g, P_A, \mathbf{a})$, $P' = (h, P_B, \mathbf{b})$ be weakly proregular resolutions of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ and $(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ respectively, and let $P_f : P_A \to P_B$ be a map which satisfies the assumptions of (P2). Assume $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, $\mathbf{b} = (P_f(a_1), \ldots, P_f(a_n))$, and using these sequences give P_A, P_B the structure of elements in CDG_n, such that $P_f : P_A \to P_B$ is a morphism in CDG_n. Letting $C_{P_A} \to P_A$ and $C_{P_B} \to P_B$ be surjective quasi-isomorphisms in CDG_n, with C_{P_A}, C_{P_B} being semi-free over $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, there is some map $\alpha : C_{P_A} \to C_{P_B}$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_A & \xrightarrow{P_f} & P_B \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ C_{P_A} & \xrightarrow[\alpha]{} & C_{P_B} \end{array}$$

in CDG_n is commutative. Applying the functor Λ^n_n to this diagram, we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda^n_n(P_A) & \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(P_f)} & \Lambda^n_n(P_B) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \Lambda^n_n(C_{P_A}) & \xrightarrow[\Lambda^n_n(\alpha)]{} & \Lambda^n_n(C_{P_B}) \end{array}$$

in which, by Lemma 3.6, the vertical maps are quasi-isomorphisms. Applying the functor $Q \circ G^n$, and using (3.44), we deduce that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{P}_A & \xrightarrow{\widehat{P}_f} & \widehat{P}_B \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(C_{P_A}))) & \xrightarrow{Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\alpha)))} & Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(C_{P_B}))) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_A, \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(P_A)) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_B, \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(P_B)) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$. On the other hand, the application of the functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda$ to the equality

$$h \circ P_f = f \circ g$$

give rise to a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_A, \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(P_A)) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_f)} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(P_B, \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(P_B)) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{L}\Lambda(g)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{L}\Lambda(h)} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \end{array}$$

Combining these two commutative diagrams with (3.51), we deduce that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{P}_A & \xrightarrow{\widehat{P}_f} & \widehat{P}_B \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_P} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_{P'}} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ is commutative, proving (P2). ∎

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.19. □

Remark 3.52. Let $\Bbbk \to \ell$ be a map between noetherian rings, and let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\ell}$. Then one can construct $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ either over ℓ or over $\Bbbk$. Since the notion of a weakly proregular resolution is independent of the base ring, it is clear from (P1) that the result is independent of the chosen base ring. Given a map $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\ell}$, (P2) shows that a similar remark applies to $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)$.

For a pair $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$, we call $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ the derived $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adic completion of A. We will sometimes denote the ideal of definition of $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ by $\widehat{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$.

Properties (P1) and (P2) guarantee immediately that the above theory contains the theory of adic completion over commutative noetherian rings, and a bit more generally:

Corollary 3.53. *Let A be a commutative ring, and let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$ be a weakly proregular ideal.*

(1) *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & A & \\ {\scriptstyle \tau^A_{\mathfrak{a}}} \swarrow & & \searrow {\scriptstyle \boldsymbol{\tau}_{(A,\mathfrak{a})}} \\ \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \mathfrak{a}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$*, in which the horizontal map is an isomorphism.*

(2) *If B is another commutative ring, $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq B$ is a weakly proregular ideal, $f : A \to B$ is a ring map, and $f(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot B = \mathfrak{b}$, then there is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{f}} & \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \mathfrak{a}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \mathfrak{b}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$*, in which the vertical maps are isomorphisms.*

Proof. This is because $(A, \mathfrak{a})$ (respectively $(B, \mathfrak{b})$) is a weakly proregular resolution of itself. □

Definition 3.54. Given a commutative DG-ring A, and a finitely generated ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$, we say that A is cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete if the map

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_{(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})} : A \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$ is an isomorphism.

Proposition 3.55. *For any $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$, the map*

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_{\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}), \widehat{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}})$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$ *is an isomorphism. Hence,* $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ *is cohomologically* $\widehat{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$*-adically complete.*

Proof. Choose some $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A^0$, such that $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(A) = \bar{\mathfrak{a}}$, and consider A as an object of CDG_n by setting $x_i \mapsto a_i$. Let $P \to A$ be a surjective quasi-isomorphism in CDG_n with P semi-free over $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Similarly, let $Q \to \Lambda^n_n(P)$ be a surjective quasi-isomorphism in CDG_n, with Q being semi-free over $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. By (P1) and Lemma 3.10, the map $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})}$ is an isomorphism if and only if the map

$$Q \to \Lambda^n_n(Q)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. By Corollay 1.5, there is a map $\alpha : P \to Q$ making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & P \\ & {\scriptstyle \alpha} \swarrow & \downarrow \\ Q & \longrightarrow & \Lambda^n_n(P) \end{array}$$

in CDG_n commutative. Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the ideal in P^0 generated by the image of $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Using the map α, we see that $Q \cong \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(P)$ in $\mathsf{D}(P^0)$, and since P is K-flat over P^0, we deduce that Q is cohomologically $\mathfrak{b}$-adically complete. Let $\mathfrak{c}$ be the ideal in Q^0 generated by the image of $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, and noting that $\mathfrak{c} = \alpha(\mathfrak{b}) \cdot Q^0$, we deduce by [15, Theorem 6.5] that Q is cohomologically $\mathfrak{c}$-adically complete. Since Q is K-flat over Q^0, this implies that the completion map $Q \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{c}}(Q)$ is a quasi-isomorphism, and this completes the proof. □

Proposition 3.56. *Let A be a commutative ring, let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$ be a finitely generated ideal, and assume that A is $\mathfrak{a}$-adically complete. Then A is cohomologically $\mathfrak{a}$-adically complete.*

Proof. Assume $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, and use these elements to give A the structure of an element of CDG_n. Let $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \to C \to A$ be a factorization of the structure map, such that C is a semi-free object, and the map $C \to A$ is a quasi-isomorphism. By (P1), it is enough to show that the map $C \to \Lambda^n_n(C)$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Since C is K-flat over $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, this is the case if and only if C is cohomologically $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$-adically complete in $\mathsf{D}(\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n])$ if and only if A is cohomologically $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$-adically complete in $\mathsf{D}(\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n])$. The fact that A is $\mathfrak{a}$-adically complete implies that it is $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$-adically complete, and since $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is a noetherian ring, by [17, Theorem 1.21], A is cohomologically $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$-adically complete, proving the claim. □

The functor $\mathrm{R}(-)_*$ was defined in (1.7).

Remark 3.57. Given a commutative ring A, and a finitely generated ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$, the canonical map $A \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)$ induces a forgetful functor $\mathsf{D}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$. Similarly, for $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$, we have seen that there is a map $\boldsymbol{\tau}_A : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Using it, we obtain an analogue "forgetful functor"

$$\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)_* : \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})) \to \mathsf{D}(A).$$

Given a DG-ring A, we finish this section with the next proposition, which describes the structure of its derived completion as a DG-module over A.

Proposition 3.58. *For any $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$, there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)_*(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})) \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(A)$$

in $\mathsf{D}(A)$.

Proof. Let $P = (f, P_A, \mathbf{a})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Using (P1), we have that

$$\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)_*(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})) \cong \widehat{P}_A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{P_A} A \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(A) \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(A).$$

□

4. Derived completion of continuous DG-ring homomorphisms

Let A, B be commutative rings, let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$ and $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq B$ be finitely generated ideals, and let $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism. Equipping A and B with the $\mathfrak{a}$-adic and $\mathfrak{b}$-adic topologies, if $f(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$, then the map f is continuous with respect to these topologies. Conversely, if f is continuous then $f(\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}}) \subseteq \sqrt{\mathfrak{b}}$, where we have denoted by $\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}}$ the radical of the ideal $\mathfrak{a}$. Given such a $f : A \to B$ with the property that $f(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it induces a map $A/\mathfrak{a}^n \to B/\mathfrak{b}^n$, and taking inverse limits, we obtain a map

$$\widehat{f} : \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B).$$

The fact that the map $A/\mathfrak{a}^n \to B/\mathfrak{b}^n$ factors as $A/\mathfrak{a}^n \to B/(\mathfrak{a}^n \cdot B) \to B/\mathfrak{b}^n$ implies that $\widehat{f}$ factors as

$$\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(f)} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}\cdot B}(B) \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}\cdot B,\mathfrak{b}}} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B).$$

The purpose of this section is to study the derived versions of these maps.

We begin with deriving the natural transformation $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}}$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{\mathfrak{b}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be two finitely generated ideals. Then there is a morphism $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}},\bar{\mathfrak{b}}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ with the following property: for any weakly proregular resolution $Q = (f, P_A, \mathbf{b})$ of $(A,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, and any subsequence $\mathbf{a} \subseteq \mathbf{b}$ with the property that $P = (f, P_A, \mathbf{a})$ is a weakly proregular resolution of $(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}(P_A) & \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}} & \Lambda_{\mathbf{b}}(P_A) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_P} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_Q} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}},\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ is commutative.

Proof. We use the notation of the proof of Theorem 3.19. Take some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. For any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, such that $\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{y}$, similarly to (3.23), we define a map $\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathrm{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathrm{y}}(A)$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ as follows: assume

$$n = |x| < m = |y|.$$

Reordering $\mathbf{y}$ so that $G_n^m(A_{\mathbf{y}}) = A_{\mathbf{x}}$, by Corollary 1.5(1), there is a quasi-isomorphism $\phi_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{y}} : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to G_n^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})$ which commutes with the maps to $A_{\mathbf{x}}$. Let $\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$ be the map in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ obtained by applying the functor $Q \circ G^n$ to the composition of maps

$$\Lambda_n^n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda_n^n(\phi_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{y}})} \Lambda_n^n(G_n^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G_n^m(\Lambda_n^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \xrightarrow{G_n^m \circ \Lambda_{n,m}^m} G_n^m(\Lambda_m^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})).$$

Notice that in the case where $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} = \bar{\mathfrak{b}}$, this map is exactly the map $\psi_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{y}}$ from (3.23). Also it is not hard to see that this map is independent of the chosen quasi-isomorphism $\phi_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{y}}$. Given $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}' \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ and $\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}' \in \mathrm{Gen}(A,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, such that $\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{x}'$, $\mathbf{y} \le \mathbf{y}'$, $\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{x}' \le \mathbf{y}'$, the proof given in Claim 1 of Theorem 3.19 applies in this slightly more general situation, and shows that the diagrams

(4.2)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A) \\ & {\scriptstyle \gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}'}} \searrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{y}'}} \\ & & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}'}(A) \end{array}$$

and

(4.3)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & & \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{x}'}} & \searrow^{\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}'}} & \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}'}(A) & \xrightarrow[\gamma_{\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{y}'}]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}'}(A) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ are commutative.

Now, given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, define a map $\gamma_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ as follows: choose some $\mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, such that $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$, and let $\gamma_{\mathbf{x}}$ be the composition

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \xrightarrow{\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}).$$

By (4.2) and the fact that $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ is the direct limit of $\{\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(A)\}$, it follows that this map is independent of the chosen $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{x}$. Now, for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, we have a map $\gamma_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, and by (4.3), if $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}' \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, then

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{x}} = \gamma_{\mathbf{x}'} \circ \psi_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{x}'}.$$

By the universal property of direct limits, this implies there is a unique map

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}},\bar{\mathfrak{b}}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}),$$

such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \\ {\scriptstyle \gamma_{\mathbf{x}}}\downarrow & \swarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}},\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}} & \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) & & \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Let $P = (f, P_A, \mathbf{a})$, $Q = (f, P_A, \mathbf{b})$ be weakly proregular resolutions as in the statement of the theorem. Let $\mathbf{x} := f(\mathbf{a}) \leq \mathbf{y} := f(\mathbf{b})$. Assume $|\mathbf{a}| = n < m = |\mathbf{b}|$, and use $\mathbf{b}$ to give P_A the structure of an element of CDG_m, such that $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ maps bijectively to $\mathbf{a}$. Let $C \to P_A$ be a surjective quasi-isomorphism in CDG_m, such that C is a semi-free object in CDG_m. By Corollary 1.5(2), there is a quasi-isomorphism $C \to C_{\mathbf{y}}$ making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_A & \longrightarrow & A_{\mathbf{y}} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ C & \longrightarrow & C_{\mathbf{y}} \end{array}$$

in CDG_m commutative. Applying the natural transformation $\Lambda^m_{n,m} : \Lambda^m_n \to \Lambda^m_m$ and the functor G^m_n, we obtain a commutative diagram

(4.4)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(P_A)) & \longrightarrow & G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(P_A)) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C)) & \longrightarrow & G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C)) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) & \longrightarrow & G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) \end{array}$$

in which, since all these DG-rings are weakly proregular, the vertical maps are quasi-isomorphisms. Note that applying the functor $Q \circ G^n$ to the top horizontal map in this diagram gives the map $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}(P_A) \to \Lambda_{\mathbf{b}}(P_A)$. Using the quasi-isomorphisms $\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{x}} : C_{\mathbf{x}} \to$

$G_n^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})$, the bottom horizontal map of this diagram fits into a commutative diagram

(4.5)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\Lambda_n^n(G_n^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G_n^m(\Lambda_n^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) & \longrightarrow & G_n^m(\Lambda_m^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) & & \\
\uparrow & & & \searrow^{1_{G_n^m(\Lambda_m^m(C_{\mathbf{y}}))}} & \\
\Lambda_n^n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) & \longrightarrow & \Lambda_n^n(G_n^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G_n^m(\Lambda_n^m(C_{\mathbf{y}})) & \longrightarrow & G_n^m(\Lambda_m^m(C_{\mathbf{y}}))
\end{array}$$

Applying the functor $Q \circ G^n$ to the bottom horizontal map in this diagram, we obtain the map $\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathrm{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathrm{y}}(A)$ constructed above. Since it fits into the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathrm{x}}(A) & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathrm{y}}(A) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}},\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})
\end{array}$$

combining this diagram with the diagrams obtained by applying $Q \circ G^n$ to (4.4) and (4.5), we are done. □

The next corollary is a derived generalization of (1.10).

Corollary 4.6. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \bar{\mathfrak{b}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be finitely generated ideals, and suppose that $\sqrt{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} = \sqrt{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}$. Then the map*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}},\bar{\mathfrak{b}}} : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ *is an isomorphism.*

Proof. We can find some $n < m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $A \in \mathsf{CDG}_m$, and such that

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(A) = \bar{\mathfrak{a}}, \quad (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(A) = \bar{\mathfrak{b}}.$$

The result now follows from Lemma 3.14 and Proposition 4.1. □

The category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$ and its homotopy category $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}})$ were defined in Section 1.5.

Definition 4.7. Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring. Given a map $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$, we define the morphism

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f) : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$ to be the image of the composition

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f')} \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(B)) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot \mathrm{H}^0(B), \bar{\mathfrak{b}}}} \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$, where f' is the map $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$ induced by f.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring. Let $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ and $g : (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \to (D, \bar{\mathfrak{d}})$ be maps in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$. Then there is an equality $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g \circ f) = \mathrm{L}\Lambda(g) \circ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)$ in* $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\Bbbk})$.

Proof. Choose some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Gen}(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Then $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathrm{Gen}(B, (\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}})))$. Choose some $\mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Gen}(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) \le \mathbf{y}$. We have that $g(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathrm{Gen}(D, (\mathrm{H}^0(g)(\bar{\mathfrak{b}}))$. Finally, choose some $\mathbf{z} \in \mathrm{Gen}(D, \bar{\mathfrak{d}})$ such that $g(\mathbf{y}) \le \mathbf{z}$. Set $n = |x| \le m = |y| \le k = |z|$.

The proofs of Theorem 3.19 and Proposition 4.1 imply there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(B) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{g(\mathbf{y})}(D) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{z}}(D) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,f(\bar{\mathfrak{a}})) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(D,g(\bar{\mathfrak{b}})) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(D,\bar{\mathfrak{d}})
\end{array}$$

where we have written for instance $f(\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ instead of $(\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$ to shorten notation. By definition, the composition of the bottom horizontal maps is equal to $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g)\circ\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)$. Note that the fact that $f(\mathbf{x})\leq\mathbf{y}$ implies that $g(f(\mathbf{x}))\leq g(\mathbf{y})\leq\mathbf{z}$. Hence, similarly, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}(D) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{z}}(D) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(D,g(f(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}))) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(D,\bar{\mathfrak{d}})
\end{array}$$

in which the composition of the bottom horizontal maps is equal to $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g\circ f)$. Because all the vertical maps in both of these diagrams are isomorphisms, it follows that in order to show that $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g\circ f)=\mathrm{L}\Lambda(g)\circ\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)$, it is enough to show that the two compositions

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A)\longrightarrow\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{f(\mathbf{x})}(B)\longrightarrow\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}(B)\longrightarrow\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{g(\mathbf{y})}(D)\longrightarrow\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{z}}(D) \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A)\longrightarrow\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}(D)\longrightarrow\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{z}}(D) \tag{4.10}$$

are equal. Let $\tilde{f}:C_{\mathbf{x}}\to C_{f(\mathbf{x})}$ and $\tilde{g}:C_{\mathbf{y}}\to C_{g(\mathbf{y})}$ be maps making the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
A_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow{f} & B_{f(\mathbf{x})} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow \\
C_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow[\tilde{f}]{} & C_{f(\mathbf{x})}
\end{array}
\qquad\qquad
\begin{array}{ccc}
B_{\mathbf{y}} & \xrightarrow{g} & D_{g(\mathbf{y})} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow \\
C_{\mathbf{y}} & \xrightarrow[\tilde{g}]{} & C_{g(\mathbf{y})}
\end{array}$$

commutative. Then by (3.37) the composition of (4.9) is obtained by applying the functor $Q\circ G^n$ to the composition of

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}})\xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\tilde{f})}\Lambda^n_n(C_{f(\mathbf{x})})\xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{f(\mathbf{x})})}\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}))=G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})\\
&\xrightarrow{G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_{n,m}}G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_m(C_{\mathbf{y}})\xrightarrow{G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_m(\tilde{g})}G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_m(C_{g(\mathbf{y})})\xrightarrow{G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_m(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(\mathbf{y})})}\\
&G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_m(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))=G^k_n\circ\Lambda^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})\xrightarrow{G^k_n\circ\Lambda^k_{m,k}}G^k_n\circ\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})
\end{aligned}$$

Using naturality of $\Lambda_{n,m}$, this is equal to the composition

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}})\xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\tilde{f})}\Lambda^n_n(C_{f(\mathbf{x})})\xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{f(\mathbf{x})})}\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}}))=G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})\\
&\xrightarrow{G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_n(\tilde{g})}G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_n(C_{g(\mathbf{y})})\xrightarrow{G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_{n,m}}G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_m(C_{g(\mathbf{y})})\xrightarrow{G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_m(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(\mathbf{y})})}\\
&G^m_n\circ\Lambda^m_m(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}))=G^k_n\circ\Lambda^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})\xrightarrow{G^k_n\circ\Lambda^k_{m,k}}G^k_n\circ\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})
\end{aligned}$$

Using naturality of $\Lambda_{n,m}$ again, this is equal to the composition of

$$\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\tilde{f})} \Lambda^n_n(C_{f(\mathbf{x})}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{f(\mathbf{x})})} \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})) = G^m_n \circ \Lambda^m_n(C_{\mathbf{y}})$$
$$\xrightarrow{G^m_n \circ \Lambda^m_n(\tilde{g})} G^m_n \circ \Lambda^m_n(C_{g(\mathbf{y})}) \xrightarrow{G^m_n \circ \Lambda^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(\mathbf{y})})} G^m_n \circ \Lambda^m_n(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{G^m_n \circ \Lambda^m_{n,m}}$$
$$G^m_n \circ \Lambda^m_m(G^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}})) = G^k_n \circ \Lambda^k_m(C_{\mathbf{z}}) \xrightarrow{G^k_n \circ \Lambda^k_{m,k}} G^k_n \circ \Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})$$

The fact that Λ^n_n is a functor implies that this is equal to the composition

(4.11)
$$\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n\left(G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(\mathbf{y})}) \circ G^m_n(\tilde{g}) \circ \phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ \tilde{f}\right)} \Lambda^n_n(G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) = G^k_n(\Lambda^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^k_{k,n}} G^k_n(\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}}))$$

Since $g(f(\mathbf{x})) \leq g(\mathbf{y}) \leq \mathbf{z}$, we have that $G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}}) = G^m_n(C_{g(\mathbf{y})}) = C_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}$, which implies that the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow{g \circ f} & D_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ C_{\mathbf{x}} & \xrightarrow[G^m_n(\tilde{g}) \circ \phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ \tilde{f}]{} & C_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))} \end{array}$$

could be used to compute the map $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(A) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}(D)$. This implies that (4.10) is equal to the application of the functor $Q \circ G^n$ to the composition

$$\Lambda^n_n(C_{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(\tilde{g}) \circ \phi^{\mathbf{y}}_{f(\mathbf{x})} \circ \tilde{f})} \Lambda^n_n(C_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))})} \Lambda^n_n(G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}}))$$
$$= G^k_n(\Lambda^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \xrightarrow{\Lambda^k_{k,n}} G^k_n(\Lambda^k_k(C_{\mathbf{z}})) \tag{4.12}$$

Comparing (4.11) and (4.12), we see that it is enough to show that

$$Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}))) = Q(G^n(\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(\mathbf{y})})))),$$

but both $\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}$ and $\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(\mathbf{y})}$ are maps $C_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))} \to G^k_n(C_{\mathbf{z}})$ which commute with the maps to $D_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}$, so they must be left homotopic. Hence, by Lemma 3.12 the maps $G^n(\Lambda^n_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(f(\mathbf{x}))}))$ and $G^n(\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(\phi^{\mathbf{z}}_{g(\mathbf{y})})))$ are left homotopic, so we are done. □

Here is the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.13. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring. The functor*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk})$$

and the natural transformation

$$\boldsymbol{\tau} : 1_{\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk})} \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda$$

extend to a functor

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk})$$

and a natural transformation

$$\boldsymbol{\tau} : 1_{\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk})} \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda$$

such that the following property holds: (*) Given a morphism $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\mathbb{k}}$, and weakly proregular resolutions $P = (g, P_A, \mathbf{a})$, $P' = (h, P_B, \mathbf{b})$ of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ and $(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ respectively, for any map $P_f : P_A \to P_B$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathbb{k}}$ making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_A & \xrightarrow{P_f} & P_B \\ {\scriptstyle g}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B \end{array}$$

commutative, and such that $P_f(\mathbf{a}) \subseteq \mathbf{b}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}(P_A) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{P}_f} & \Lambda_{\mathbf{b}}(P_B) \\ {\scriptstyle \varphi_P}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_{P'}} \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathbb{k}})$ is commutative.

Proof. Again, we write CDG (respectively $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$, $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$) for $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathbb{k}}$ (resp. $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\mathbb{k}}$, $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\mathbb{k}}$). Since $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}})$ has the same objects as $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$, we have already defined $\mathrm{L}\Lambda$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ on objects. Given a map $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$, we use Definition 4.7 to obtain a map

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f) : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}),$$

and by Proposition 4.8, this defines a functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}})$ which extends the functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}} \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}})$. Since $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$ and $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$ have the same weak equivalences, we deduce that it lifts to a functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda : \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}})$. Extension of the natural transformation $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ is now routine, and we leave the details to the reader.

It remains to prove the property (*) above. Note that it might seem that it follows immediately from the combination of (P2) and Proposition 4.1, but this is not the case, since we do not know if the sequence $P_f(\mathbf{a}) \subseteq (P_B)^0$ is weakly proregular [1]. Assume $|\mathbf{a}| = n < m = |\mathbf{b}|$. Using the sequences $\mathbf{a} \subseteq (P_A)^0$ and $\mathbf{b} \subseteq (P_B)^0$, give P_A and P_B the structure of elements of CDG_n and CDG_m respectively, so that P_f is a map $P_A \to G_n^m(P_B)$ in CDG_n. The map $\widehat{P}_f : \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}(P_A) \to \Lambda_{\mathbf{b}}(P_B)$ is equal to the application of the functor G^n to the composition

$$\Lambda_n^n(P_A) \xrightarrow{\Lambda_n^n(P_f)} \Lambda_n^n(G_n^m(P_B)) = G_n^m(\Lambda_n^m(P_B)) \xrightarrow{G_n^m(\Lambda_{n,m}^m)} G_n^m(\Lambda_m^m(P_B)) \tag{4.14}$$

Let $C_A \to P_A$ and $C_B \to P_B$ be surjective quasi-isomorphisms in CDG_n and CDG_m respectively, with C_A being a semi-free object in CDG_n, and C_B being a semi-free object in CDG_m. Let $C_f : C_A \to G_n^m(C_B)$ be some lift of P_f. Since it holds that $(C_f(x_1), \ldots, C_f(x_n))$ is a weakly proregular sequence in C_B^0, by (P2) and Proposition

[1] This is a particular case of the following problem which as far as we know is open: given a commutative ring A, a weakly proregular sequence $\mathbf{b}$, and a subsequence $\mathbf{a} \subseteq \mathbf{b}$, must $\mathbf{a}$ be weakly proregular?

4.1 there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
G^n(\Lambda^n_n(C_A)) & \longrightarrow & G^n(\Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_B))) = G^m(\Lambda^m_n(C_B)) & \longrightarrow & G^m(\Lambda^m_m(C_B)) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A,\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f')]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}})) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}),\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}]{} & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(B,\bar{\mathfrak{b}})
\end{array}$$

where we have let $f' : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \mathrm{H}^0(f)(\bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$ be the map in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$ induced by f. Note that by definition, composition along the bottom horizontal map of this diagram is equal to $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(f)$. Since (4.14) fits into the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\Lambda^n_n(P_A) & \longrightarrow & \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(P_B)) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(P_B)) & \longrightarrow & G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(P_B)) \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
\Lambda^n_n(C_A) & \longrightarrow & \Lambda^n_n(G^m_n(C_B)) = G^m_n(\Lambda^m_n(C_B)) & \longrightarrow & G^m_n(\Lambda^m_m(C_B))
\end{array}$$

and since by definition of the map φ_P (respectively $\varphi_{P'}$), it factors through the inverse of the isomorphism $\Lambda^n_n(C_A) \to \Lambda^n_n(P_A)$ (resp. $\Lambda^n_n(C_B) \to \Lambda^n_n(P_B)$), we are done. □

5. The functors $\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$

Given a commutative ring A, a finitely generated ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$, and an A-module M, recall that the modules $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$, $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$ carry naturally the structure of $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)$-modules. We denote these $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)$-modules by $\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$ and $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$. These are additive functors

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}}(-), \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) : \mathrm{Mod}(A) \to \mathrm{Mod}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)).$$

They have derived functors

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}}(-), \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)).$$

If $F : \mathsf{D}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$ is the forgetful functor, it is clear that

$$F \circ \mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) \cong \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(-), \quad F \circ \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(-) \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(-). \tag{5.1}$$

We now define analogue functors in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}})$. We will make use of the functors $\mathrm{R}(-)_*, \mathrm{L}(-)^*$ and $\mathrm{R}(-)^\flat$ which were defined in (1.7). We begin by imitating Definition 2.3.

Definition 5.2. Let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the ideal in B^0 generated by $\mathbf{b}$, and let $\phi_P : \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(P) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ be the isomorphism from (P1). The operations

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{b}}(-) := \varinjlim_n \mathrm{Hom}_{B^0}(B^0/\mathfrak{b}^n, -), \quad \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{b}}(-) := \varprojlim_n B^0/\mathfrak{b}^n \otimes_{B^0} -$$

define additive functors $\mathrm{DGMod}(B) \to \mathrm{DGMod}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B))$. Let

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{b}}, \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{b}} : \mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B))$$

be their derived functors, and set

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) := \mathrm{L}(\phi_P)^* \mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}f_*(-))$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) := \mathrm{R}(\phi_P)^\flat \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}f_*(-)).$$

These are functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $(B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular DG-ring. Then there are isomorphisms*

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{b}}(-) \cong \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B) \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{B} \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(-)$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{b}}(-) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_{B}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B), \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(-))$$

of functors

$$\mathsf{D}(B) \to \mathsf{D}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B)).$$

Proof. Identical to the proof of [24, Theorems 3.2, 3.6], using (2.5) and (2.6). □

Proposition 5.4. *Let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$, and let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Then there are isomorphisms*

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}^{P}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{L}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)^*(\mathrm{R}\Gamma^{P}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-))$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}^{P}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)^{\flat}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda^{P}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)).$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$. In particular, if Q is another weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, there are natural isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}^{P}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}^{Q}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}^{P}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}^{Q}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-).$$

Proof. The first claim follows from Lemma 5.3 and functoriality of of $\mathrm{L}(-)^*$ and $\mathrm{R}(-)^{\flat}$. The second claim now follows from Corollary 2.14. □

In view of this result, we denote this functors simply by

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}, \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} : \mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})).$$

The next result is a version of (5.1) in this context.

Proposition 5.5. *For any $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$, there are isomorphisms*

$$\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)^* \mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} \cong \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$$

and

$$\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)^* \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$.

Proof. Let $P = (f, B, \mathbf{b})$ be a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. By (P1), we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ {\scriptstyle \tau_P}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \boldsymbol{\tau}_A} \\ \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(P) & \xrightarrow[\phi_P]{} & \Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ in which the horizontal maps are isomorphisms. Hence, by functoriality of $\mathrm{R}(-)_*$, we have natural isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)^* \mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}^{P}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} \cong \mathrm{R}(\tau_P \circ f^{-1})_* \mathrm{R}(\phi_P)_* \mathrm{L}(\phi_P)^* \mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}f_*(-))$$

Since ϕ_P is an isomorphism, we have an isomorphism of functors

$$\mathrm{R}(\phi_P)_* \mathrm{L}(\phi_P)^*(-) \cong 1_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(P)},$$

so that

$$\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A)^*\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}^P_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}} \cong \mathrm{R}(f^{-1})_*\mathrm{R}(\tau_P)_*\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}f_*(-)) \cong \mathrm{R}(f^{-1})_*\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{R}f_*(-)) \cong \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-).$$

The second claim is proven similarly. □

Proposition 5.6. *Let $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ be a map in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(\mathrm{R}f^\flat(-)) \cong \mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_B \circ f)^\flat(\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-))$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}))$.

Proof. Using Proposition 5.4, we may write

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}\mathrm{R}f^\flat(-) \cong \mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_B)^\flat(\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(\mathrm{R}f^\flat(-))).$$

By Proposition 2.17, we have that

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(\mathrm{R}f^\flat(-)) \cong \mathrm{R}f^\flat(\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)).$$

Hence,

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}\mathrm{R}f^\flat(-) \cong \mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_B)^\flat \circ \mathrm{R}f^\flat(\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)) = \mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_B \circ f)^\flat(\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)).$$

□

Remark 5.7. In less cryptic language, if all these morphisms in the homotopy category were honest morphisms of DG-rings, the above result says that there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(B, -) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(\widehat{B}, \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)).$$

Proposition 5.8. *Let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$, and let $f : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to B$ be a map in CDG. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{R}(f)^\flat(\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)) \cong \mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A \circ f)^\flat(\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-))$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$.

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 5.4. □

Remark 5.9. Again, in less cryptic language, this result essentially says that there is a natural isomorphism

$$\mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_{\widehat{A}}(B, \mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)) \cong \mathrm{R}\operatorname{Hom}_A(B, \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)),$$

and thus, allows one to compare certain Ext-modules over A and $\widehat{A}$.

The next results are dual to Propositions 5.6, 5.8. We omit the similar proofs.

Proposition 5.10. *Let $f : (A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ be a map in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}}$. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}(\mathrm{L}f^*(-)) \cong \mathrm{L}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_B \circ f)^*(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-))$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}))$.

Proposition 5.11. *Let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$, and let $f : \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \to B$ be a map in CDG. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{L}(f)^*(\mathrm{R}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)) \cong \mathrm{L}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_A \circ f)^*(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-))$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(B)$.

Remark 5.12. In case A and B are commutative rings, and all ideals in question are weakly proregular, Propositions 5.6, 5.8, 5.10 and 5.11 were essentially proved in [24, Corollary 3.11], [24, Corollary 3.12], [24, Corollary 3.13], [24, Corollary 3.14]. The above results show that with our notion of derived completion of DG-rings, the weakly proregular hypothesis can be removed from the results of [24].

6. Finiteness conditions

In the previous sections, a very general theory of completion and torsion was developed. In this final section we discuss the behavior of these general constructions in the presence of some finiteness conditions.

6.1. **Completion over commutative DG-rings in the noetherian case.** The first result of this section describes the H^0 of a derived completion in many interesting situations.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\mathbb{k}$ be a noetherian ring, and let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\mathbb{k}}$. Assume that as an ideal of the ring $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$, $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is weakly proregular. Then there is a $\mathbb{k}$-algebra isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{H}^0(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})) \cong \Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\mathrm{H}^0(A)).$$

Proof. Let $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = (\bar{a}_1, \ldots, \bar{a}_n)$ be a finite set of elements of $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ that generates $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$, and let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ be some lifts of these elements to A^0. Using these sets of elements, we give A and $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ the structure of elements of CDG_n, and it follows that the map $A \to \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is a map in CDG_n. Let $C_A \to A$ and $C_{\bar{A}} \to \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be surjective quasi-isomorphisms in CDG_n, such that $C_A, C_{\bar{A}}$ are semi-free objects, and such that there is a commutative diagram

(6.2)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{H}^0(A) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ C_A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & C_{\bar{A}} \end{array}$$

in CDG_n. By (P2), we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{C}_A & \xrightarrow{\widehat{f}} & \widehat{C}_{\bar{A}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{L}\Lambda(\mathrm{H}^0(A), \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \end{array}$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$, such that the vertical maps are isomorphisms. Since $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is weakly proregular, we have that

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(\mathrm{H}^0(A), \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \cong \Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\mathrm{H}^0(A)).$$

Hence,

(6.3)
$$\mathrm{H}^0(\widehat{C}_{\bar{A}}) \cong \Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\mathrm{H}^0(A)).$$

We may extract the following commutative diagram with exact rows from (6.2):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} C_A^{-1} & \longrightarrow & C_A^0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{H}^0(A) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ C_{\bar{A}}^{-1} & \longrightarrow & C_{\bar{A}}^0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{H}^0(A) & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Considered over the noetherian ring $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, we see that

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} C_A^{-1} & \longrightarrow & C_A^0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ C_{\bar{A}}^{-1} & \longrightarrow & C_{\bar{A}}^0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

are both truncations of projective resolutions of the $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$-module $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$. Hence, applying the functor $\Lambda_{(x_1,\ldots,x_n)}$ to this diagram and taking cohomology, at both rows we must obtain the classical 0-th derived functor $\mathrm{L}^0\Lambda_{(x_1,\ldots,x_n)}(\bar{A})$, which by (6.3) is isomorphic to $\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\mathrm{H}^0(A))$. Thus, we deduce that

$$\mathrm{H}^0(\widehat{C}_A) \cong \Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\mathrm{H}^0(A)),$$

so the isomorphism $\widehat{C}_A \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ implies the required result. □

Corollary 6.4. *Let A be a commutative DG-ring, such that $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is a noetherian ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be an ideal. Then*

$$\mathrm{H}^0(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})) \cong \Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(\mathrm{H}^0(A)).$$

In particular $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$ is a noetherian ring. If moreover $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is a local noetherian ring, and $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is its maximal ideal, then $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$ is also a noetherian local ring, and $\widehat{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}$ is its maximal ideal.

We say that a commutative DG-ring is cohomologically noetherian if $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is a noetherian ring, and for each $i < 0$, $\mathrm{H}^i(A)$ is a finitely generated $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$-module (the terminology in [32] is cohomologically pseudo-noetherian). As explained in [32], for a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring A, the category $\mathsf{D}(A)$ has a full triangulated subcategory $\mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{f}}(A)$, made of DG-modules whose cohomologies are finitely generated over the noetherian ring $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$. In particular, the fact that A is cohomologically noetherian implies that $A \in \mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{f}}(A)$.

Question 6.5. Let A be a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be an ideal. Is $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ cohomologically noetherian?

By the above corollary, $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$ is a noetherian ring, but we do not know if the cohomologies of $\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ are finitely generated over $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}))$.

To overcome our inability to answer this basic question, we add an additional rather weak assumption, and using it, obtain a good theory of completion over noetherian DG-rings. We learned the following notion from Yekutieli.

Definition 6.6. Let A be a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring. We say that A has a noetherian model if there is an isomorphism $A \cong B$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$, such that the ring B^0 is noetherian. We say B is a noetherian model of A.

We do not know if every cohomologically noetherian DG-ring has a noetherian model. Experts in the field we consulted about this question expressed doubts that this is the case. However, most cohomologically noetherian DG-rings that arise in nature do posses a noetherian model, as the next result shows:

Proposition 6.7. *Let A be a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring. Assume that there is a noetherian ring $\Bbbk$, and a map $\Bbbk \to A$, such that the induced map $\Bbbk \to \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is surjective. Then A has a noetherian model.*

Proof. In this situation, the standard construction of a semi-free resolution

$$\Bbbk \to B \xrightarrow{\simeq} A$$

of $\Bbbk \to A$ gives a commutative DG-ring B, quasi-isomorphic to A, such that $B^0 = \Bbbk$, and such that for each i, B^i is a finitely generated free B^0-module (see [32, Lemma 7.8]). Hence, B is a noetherian model for A. □

Remark 6.8. Let A be a commutative ring, let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$ be a finitely generated ideal, let B be a commutative DG-ring, and let $A \to B$ be a map of commutative DG-rings. We have seen in Remark 3.2 that $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(B)$ is a commutative DG-ring. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the ring map $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) \to A/\mathfrak{a}^n$ give rise to a map of commutative DG-rings

$$\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) \otimes_A B \to A/\mathfrak{a}^n \otimes_A B,$$

so passing to the inverse limit, we see that in this case the canonical map

$$\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) \otimes_A B \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(B)$$

is a map of commutative DG-rings.

Proposition 6.9. *Let A be a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring with a noetherian model B, let $\bar{\mathfrak{b}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(B)$ be a finitely generated ideal, and let $\mathfrak{b} = \pi_B^{-1}(\bar{\mathfrak{b}})$. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \cong B \otimes_{B^0} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B^0)$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$.

Proof. Let $B^0 \to C \xrightarrow{\simeq} B$ be a semi-free resolution of $B^0 \to B$, with $C^0 = B^0$, and C^i being a finitely generated free C^0-module for all $i < 0$. Let $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{b} \subseteq C^0$. Then $(C, \mathfrak{c})$ is a weakly proregular resolution of $(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$, so by (P1), we have an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \cong \Lambda_{\mathfrak{c}}(C).$$

Since $C \in \mathsf{D}^-_{\mathrm{f}}(C^0)$, the natural map

$$\Lambda_{\mathfrak{c}}(C^0) \otimes_{C^0} C \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{c}}(C)$$

is an isomorphism of complexes, and by Remark 6.8, it is an isomorphism of DG-rings. Since C is a semi-free resolution of B over B^0, we deduce that

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \cong \Lambda_{\mathfrak{c}}(C) \cong \Lambda_{\mathfrak{c}}(C^0) \otimes_{C^0} C \cong B \otimes_{B^0} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}(B^0).$$

□

See [32, Section 2] for the notion of a cohomological dimension of a functor between derived categories of DG-modules. Recall ([25, Definition 6.2]) that a map of commutative DG-rings $A \to B$ is said to be of flat dimension 0 if the functor $- \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_A B$ has cohomological dimension 0. Similarly, let us say that a map $f : A \to B$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$ has flat dimension 0 is the functor $\mathrm{L}f^*$ has flat dimension 0. As a corollary of Proposition 6.9, we deduce:

Corollary 6.10. *Let A be a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring with a noetherian model, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be a finitely generated ideal. Then the map $\boldsymbol{\tau}_A : A \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ has flat dimension* 0.

Given a noetherian ring A an ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$, and a finitely generated A-module M, it is well known that $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \cong M \otimes_A \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)$. Similarly, we have:

Proposition 6.11. *Let A be a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring with a noetherian model, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be a finitely generated ideal. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(A) \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{A} -$$

of functors $\mathsf{D}^{-}_{\mathrm{f}}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$, and an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-) \cong \mathrm{L}\boldsymbol{\tau}^{*}_{A}(-)$$

of functors

$$\mathsf{D}^{-}_{\mathrm{f}}(A) \to \mathsf{D}(\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})).$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 6.9, we may assume without loss of generality that A^0 is noetherian, and that for each $i < 0$, A^i is a finitely generated free A^0-module. Letting $\mathfrak{a} = \pi_A^{-1}(\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, we see that $(A, \mathfrak{a})$ is a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Hence, instead of computing $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)$ and $\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(-)$, we may compute $\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(-)$ and $\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(-)$. Then, given $M \in \mathsf{D}^{-}_{\mathrm{f}}(A)$, we have natural isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \cong M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{A^0} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A^0) \cong M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{A} A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{A^0} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A^0) \cong M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{A} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A) \cong M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{A} \mathrm{L}\Lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(A)$$

in $\mathsf{D}(A)$, and similarly

$$\mathrm{L}\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \cong M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{A^0} \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(A^0) \cong M \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{A} \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)$$

in $\mathsf{D}(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}(A))$. □

Given a commutative noetherian ring A, an ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$, and an injective module I, it is well known that $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(I)$ is also an injective A-module. It follows that for any $M \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(A)$, $\operatorname{injdim}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)) \leq \operatorname{injdim}_A(M)$. We finish this section with asking analogously:

Question 6.12. Let A be a cohomologically noetherian DG-ring, let $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$, and let $M \in \mathrm{DGMod}(A)$. Is it true that

$$\operatorname{injdim}_A(\mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\bar{\mathfrak{a}}}(M)) \leq \operatorname{injdim}_A(M)?$$

6.2. **The category $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$.** Fix a commutative noetherian ring $\Bbbk$. The aim of this final section is to introduce and study a category of commutative DG-rings over $\Bbbk$, which contains the essentially finite type $\Bbbk$-algebras and the adically complete algebras which are formally essentially of finite type over $\Bbbk$, and in addition, is closed under operations of derived completed tensor product, derived completed localization and derived completion. Such a category contains exactly the affine pieces of a reasonable theory of derived formal schemes. Recall that a homomorphism $(A, \mathfrak{a}) \to (B, \mathfrak{b})$ between noetherian adic rings is called formally essentially of finite type if the induced map $A \to B/\mathfrak{b}$ is essentially of finite type. See [30, Section 1] for a study of this notion.

First, we introduce a general operation of derived completed tensor product. Let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ and $(B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}})$ be objects of $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$. Since A and B are non-positive, by the Künneth trick we have that

$$\mathrm{H}^0(A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B) \cong \mathrm{H}^0(A) \otimes_{\Bbbk} \mathrm{H}^0(B).$$

We make $A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B$ an object of $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}}$ by letting

$$\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \mathrm{H}^0(B) + \mathrm{H}^0(A) \otimes_{\Bbbk} \bar{\mathfrak{b}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B) \tag{6.13}$$

be its ideal of definition, and denote by $A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B$ the derived completion of $A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B$ with respect to this ideal.

Example 6.14. Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring, let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$, and suppose that A is cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete. We have seen in (1.9) that there is a natural map $A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} A \to A$, and it is easy to verify that with respect to the ideal (6.13), this is a map in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ (actually, it is even in $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{ad}\,/\Bbbk}$). Applying the functor $\mathrm{L}\Lambda$ to this map, and using the fact that A is cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete, we obtain a map

$$\widehat{\Delta}_A : A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} A \to A$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$. The map $\widehat{\Delta}_A$ is the correct homological completed diagonal map of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ over $\Bbbk$. As far as we know, this construction is new even in the case where $A = \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is an ordinary commutative noetherian ring which is adically complete with respect to some ideal. Associated to $\widehat{\Delta}_A$ are the following two functors:

$$\mathrm{L}(\widehat{\Delta}_A)^* : \mathsf{D}(A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$$

and

$$\mathrm{R}(\widehat{\Delta}_A)^\flat : \mathsf{D}(A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} A) \to \mathsf{D}(A)$$

which ought to be called **adic Shukla homology and cohomology** (or adic derived Hochschild homology and cohomology). Of particular interest are the DG-modules over A:

$$\mathrm{L}(\widehat{\Delta}_A)^*(\mathrm{R}(\widehat{\Delta}_A)_*(A))$$

and

$$\mathrm{R}(\widehat{\Delta}_A)^\flat(\mathrm{R}(\widehat{\Delta}_A)_*(A)),$$

which are simply the adic Shukla homology and cohomology with coefficients in A.

Applying Propositions 5.6, 5.8, 5.10 and 5.11 to these constructions, we obtain relations between Shukla homology and cohomology and their adic counterparts, similarly to the case of commutative algebras discussed in [24, Sections 4,5].

Definition 6.15. Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring. A pair $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ is called cohomologically formally essentially of finite type over $\Bbbk$ if the following holds:

(1) A is cohomologically noetherian.
(2) A is cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete.
(3) The $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete noetherian $\Bbbk$-algebra $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is formally essentially of finite type, i.e, the $\Bbbk$-algebra $\mathrm{H}^0(A)/\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is essentially of finite type.

We denote by $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$ the full subcategory of $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathsf{cont}\,/\Bbbk}$ made of the cohomologically formally essentially of finite type DG-rings over $\Bbbk$, and by $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk})$ its homotopy category.

Note that (3) makes sense, since by (1) the ring $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is a noetherian, and hence by (2) and Corollary 6.4, $\mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete.

Example 6.16. Given a cohomologically noetherian DG ring A over $\Bbbk$, one says that A is cohomologically essentially of finite type over $\Bbbk$ if the induced map $\Bbbk \to \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ is essentially of finite type. We see that all cohomologically essentially of finite type $\Bbbk$-algebras belong to $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$, when given the 0-adic topology. In particular, $\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$ contains the finite type and essentially of finite type $\Bbbk$-algebras.

Lemma 6.17. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring, and let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$. Then there are integers n, m, a multiplicatively closed set $U \subseteq \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, and a commutative DG-ring B which satisfies the following:*

(1) *There is an isomorphism $A \to B$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk})$.*

(2) *We have that* $B^0 = (U^{-1}\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n])[[y_1, \dots, y_m]]$*, and for each* $i < 0$*,* B^i *is a finitely generated free* B^0*-module.*
(3) *The ideal* $\bar{\mathfrak{b}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(B)$ *obtained by the image of* $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ *is generated by the images of* $(y_1, \dots, y_m)$*.*
(4) *In particular,* B *is K-flat over* $\Bbbk$*.*

Proof. Let $(C, \mathbf{c})$ be some weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ over $\Bbbk$. Let

$$S = \{s \in C^0 | \pi_C(s) \text{ is invertible in } \mathrm{H}^0(C)\}.$$

This is clearly a multiplicatively closed subset of C^0, and according to the proof of [32, Lemma 7.8], the map $\phi : C \to C \otimes_{C^0} (S^{-1}C^0)$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Let $D = C \otimes_{C^0} (S^{-1}C^0$, and notice that since the map $\phi^0 : C^0 \to D^0$ is flat, letting $\mathbf{d} = (\phi(\mathbf{c})) = (d_1, \dots, d_m)$, flatness of the map $C^0 \to S^{-1}C^0$ ensures that $(D, \mathbf{d})$ is also a weakly proregular DG-ring. Letting $\mathfrak{d}$ be the ideal in D^0 generated by $\mathbf{d}$, and $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ its image in $\mathrm{H}^0(D)$, since A is cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete, and since $A \cong D$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk})$, we deduce that D is cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$-adically complete. Hence, the completion map $\tau_D : D \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}(D)$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Set $E = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}(D)$. We let $\widehat{\mathbf{d}} = (\widehat{d}_1, \dots, \widehat{d}_n)$ be the image of $\mathbf{d}$ in E, $\widehat{\mathfrak{d}}$ be the ideal generated by $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}$ in E^0, and $\widehat{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}$ its image in $\mathrm{H}^0(E)$.

Since $\mathrm{H}^0(E)/\widehat{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}$ is essentially of finite type over $\Bbbk$, by [13, Lemma 2.4.3], the map $\Bbbk \to \mathrm{H}^0(E)$ factors as

$$\Bbbk \hookrightarrow (U^{-1}\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n])[[y_1, \dots, y_m]] \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} \mathrm{H}^0(E),$$

such that $y_i \mapsto \widehat{\bar{d}}_i$, and such that the map $\bar{f}$ is surjective.

Define a map of commutative rings

$$f : (U^{-1}\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n])[y_1, \dots, y_m] \to D^0$$

as follows: first, choose $l_1, \dots, l_n \in D^0$ such that $f(x_i) = \pi_D(\tau_D(l_i))$. These define a map $g : \Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n] \to D^0$. For any $u \in U \subseteq \Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, it is clear that the image of $g(u)$ in $\mathrm{H}^0(E)$ is a unit, and this implies that g localize to a map $U^{-1}g : U^{-1}\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n] \to D^0$. Mapping $y_i \mapsto d_i$, we obtain this extended map f. Now, applying the completion functor $\Lambda_{(y_1, \dots, y_m)}$ to the map $(U^{-1}\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n])[y_1, \dots, y_m] \to D$, we obtain a map

$$(U^{-1}\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n])[[y_1, \dots, y_m]] \xrightarrow{h} E,$$

such that $\pi_E \circ h = \bar{f}$.

Applying the standard construction of a semi-free resolution

$$(U^{-1}\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n])[[y_1, \dots, y_m]] \to B \xrightarrow{\simeq} E,$$

of h, we obtain the required DG-ring B. □

Proposition 6.18. *Let* $\Bbbk$ *be a noetherian ring, and let* $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}), (B, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$*. Then* $A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\Bbbk}$.

Proof. Choose isomorphisms $\tilde{A} \xrightarrow{\simeq} A$ and $\tilde{B} \xrightarrow{\simeq} B$ of the form of Lemma 6.17. Then $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$ are K-flat over $\Bbbk$, so that

$$A \otimes^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B \cong \tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B}.$$

Notice that because of the structure of $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}$, for each $i < 0$ we have that $(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B})^i$ is a finitely generated free $(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B})^0$-module. Assume

$$\tilde{A}^0 = (U^{-1}\Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_n])[[y_1, \dots, y_m]]$$

and

$$\tilde{B}^0 = (V^{-1}\Bbbk[w_1, \ldots, w_r])[[z_1, \ldots, z_l]].$$

Let

$$\mathbf{I} := (y_1 \otimes 1, \ldots, y_m \otimes 1, 1 \otimes z_1, \ldots, 1 \otimes z_l) \subseteq (\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B})^0,$$

and let I be the ideal generated by $\mathbf{I}$. According to [24, Theorem 2.6], the ideal I is weakly proregular. Hence, we deduce that $(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B}, \mathbf{I})$ is a weakly proregular DG-ring. It follows that

$$A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B \cong \Lambda_I(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B}).$$

The fact that each $(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B})^i$ is a finitely generated free over $(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B})^0$ implies now that $\Lambda_I(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B})^i$ is finitely generated free over $\Lambda_I(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B})^0$. But now we are done, because $\Lambda_I(\tilde{A} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \tilde{B})^0$ is noetherian and formally essentially of finite type over $\Bbbk$, so the same is true for its quotient $\mathrm{H}^0(A \widehat{\otimes}^{\mathrm{L}}_{\Bbbk} B)$. □

Given a commutative DG-ring A, and a multiplicatively closed set $\bar{S} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$, recall ([32, Section 4]), that the localization of A with respect to $\bar{S}$ is the map

$$\phi_{\bar{S}} : A \to A \otimes_{A^0} S^{-1}A^0,$$

where $S = \pi_A^{-1}(\bar{S})$. We set

$$\bar{S}^{-1}A := A \otimes_{A^0} S^{-1}A^0.$$

Definition 6.19. Suppose that A is cohomologically $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$-adically complete, with respect to a finitely generated ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$. Let $\bar{S} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be a multiplicatively closed set. We define the derived completed localization of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$ with respect to $\bar{S}$ to be the composition of the maps

$$A \to \bar{S}^{-1}A \to \mathrm{L}\Lambda(\bar{S}^{-1}A, \bar{S}^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$$

in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathsf{CDG})$, where

$$\bar{S}^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{a}} := \bar{S}^{-1}\mathrm{H}^0(A) \otimes_{\mathrm{H}^0(A)} \bar{\mathfrak{a}}.$$

Proposition 6.20. *Let $\Bbbk$ be a noetherian ring, let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}/\Bbbk}$, and let $\bar{S} \subseteq \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be a multiplicatively closed subset. Then*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(\bar{S}^{-1}A, \bar{S}^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}/\Bbbk}$$

Proof. We may replace A by an isomorphic DG-ring over $\Bbbk$, of the form of Lemma 6.17. Assuming A itself is of this form, and letting $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_m) \subseteq A^0$, we see that $(A, \mathbf{y})$ is a weakly proregular resolution of $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}})$. Let S be the lift of $\bar{S}$ to A^0. Flatness of the localization map $A^0 \to S^{-1}A^0$ implies that

$$(\bar{S}^{-1}A, S^{-1}\mathbf{y})$$

is a weakly proregular resolution of $(\bar{S}^{-1}A, \bar{S}^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{a}})$, where $S^{-1}\mathbf{y}$ is the image of $\mathbf{y}$ under the localization map. Hence, there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(\bar{S}^{-1}A, \bar{S}^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \cong \Lambda_{S^{-1}\mathbf{y}}(\bar{S}^{-1}A).$$

The latter DG-ring is clearly cohomologically noetherian and cohomologically adically complete, and the $\Bbbk$-linear isomorphisms

$$\Lambda_{S^{-1}\mathbf{y}}(\bar{S}^{-1}A)/((S^{-1}\mathbf{y}) \cdot \Lambda_{S^{-1}\mathbf{y}}(\bar{S}^{-1}A)) \cong (\bar{S}^{-1}A)/(S^{-1}\mathbf{y}) \cong S^{-1}(A/(\mathbf{y}))$$

imply that it is cohomologically formally essentially of finite type over $\Bbbk$. □

With the exact same technique, we obtain:

Proposition 6.21. *Let $\mathbb{k}$ be a noetherian ring, let $(A, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\mathbb{k}}$, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{b}} \subset \mathrm{H}^0(A)$ be a finitely generated ideal that contains $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{L}\Lambda(A, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}) \in \mathsf{CDG}_{\mathrm{feft}\,/\mathbb{k}}$$

And this completes the proof of Theorem 0.4 from the introduction.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Luchezar Avramov, Pieter Belmans, Srikanth Iyengar, Sebastian Klein, Wendy Lowen, Birgit Richter, Boris Shoikhet, Donald Stanley, Rishi Vyas and Amnon Yekutieli for some helpful discussions. Some of these discussions took place at the meeting *Hochschild Cohomology in Algebra, Geometry, and Topology* at Oberwolfach. The author is grateful to the MFO for their hospitality.

REFERENCES

[1] Avramov, L. L., and Foxby, H. B. (1992). Locally Gorenstein homomorphisms. American Journal of Mathematics, 114(5), 1007-1047.
[2] Avramov, L. L., Iyengar, S. B., Lipman, J., and Nayak, S. (2010). Reduction of derived Hochschild functors over commutative algebras and schemes. Advances in Mathematics, 223(2), 735-772.
[3] Alonso L., Jeremias A. and Lipman, J (1997). Local homology and cohomology on schemes. Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. (Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 1-39).
[4] Barthel, T., Heard, D., and Valenzuela, G. (2015). Local duality in algebra and topology. arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03526.
[5] Dwyer, W. G., and Greenless, J. P. C. (2002). Complete modules and torsion modules. American Journal of Mathematics, 199-220.
[6] Dwyer, W. G., Greenlees, J. P. C., and Iyengar, S. B, (2006). Duality in algebra and topology. Advances in Mathematics, 200(2), 357-402.
[7] Dwyer, W. G., Hirschhorn, P. S., Kan, D. M and Smith, H. S, Homotopy limit functors on model categories and homotopical categories, volume 113 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004
[8] Hirschhorn, P. S. (2009). Model categories and their localizations (No. 99). American Mathematical Soc..
[9] Iacono, D., and Manetti, M. (2013). Semiregularity and obstructions of complete intersections. Advances in Mathematics, 235, 92-125.
[10] Kan, D. M. (1958). Adjoint functors. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 87(2), 294-329.
[11] Keller, B. (1994). Deriving DG categories. Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. (Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 63-102).
[12] Krause, H. (2008). Localization theory for triangulated categories. arXiv preprint arXiv:0806.1324.
[13] Lipman, J., Nayak, S., and Sastry, P. (2005). Pseudofunctorial behavior of Cousin complexes on formal schemes. Part of: Variance and duality for Cousin complexes on formal schemes (Vol. 375). American Mathematical Soc..
[14] Lurie, J. (2011). Derived algebraic geometry XII: proper morphisms, completions, and the Grothendieck existence theorem. Preprint available at http://www.math.harvard.edu/~ lurie/
[15] Porta, M., Shaul, L., and Yekutieli, A. (2014). On the homology of completion and torsion. Algebras and Representation Theory, 17(1), 31-67.
[16] Porta, M., Shaul, L., and Yekutieli, A. (2015). Erratum to: On the Homology of Completion and Torsion. Algebras and Representation Theory, 18(5), 1401-1405.
[17] Porta, M., Shaul, L., and Yekutieli, A. (2015). Cohomologically cofinite complexes. Communications in Algebra, 43(2), 597-615.
[18] Positselski, L. (2016). Dedualizing complexes and MGM duality. Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra, 220(12), 3866-3909.
[19] Rezk, C. (1996). A model category for categories, preprint, available at http://www.math.uiuc.edu/~ rezk
[20] Sather-Wagstaff, S., & Wicklein, R. (2016). Extended Local Cohomology and Local Homology. Algebras and Representation Theory. Advance online publication. doi:10.1007/s10468-016-9616-5.
[21] Schenzel, P. (2003). Proregular sequences, local cohomology, and completion. Mathematica scandinavica, 92(2), 161-180.
[22] Serre, J. P. (1965). Algebre locale. Multiplicites, Cours au College de France, 1957-1958, redige par Pierre Gabriel. Seconde edition, 1965. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 11.
[23] Shaul, L. (2014). Tensor product of dualizing complexes over a field. To appear in Journal of Commutative Algebra. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3759v2.

[24] Shaul, L. (2016). Hochschild cohomology commutes with adic completion. Algebra & Number Theory 10-5, 1001-1029.
[25] Shaul, L. (2015). The twisted inverse image pseudofunctor over commutative DG rings and perfect base change. arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.05583v1.
[26] Shaul, L. (2016). Adic reduction to the diagonal and a relation between cofiniteness and derived completion. arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.03874v2.
[27] Spaltenstein, N. (1988). Resolutions of unbounded complexes. Compositio Mathematica, 65(2), 121-154.
[28] Stacks Project Authors, The Stacks Project, http://stacks.math.columbia.edu.
[29] Stanley, D. (1997). Determining Closed Model Category Structures, preprint, available at http://hopf.math.purdue.edu/cgi-bin/generate?/Stanley/stanley1.
[30] Yekutieli, A. (1998). Smooth formal embeddings and the residue complex. Canadian Journal of Mathematics, 50(4), 863.
[31] Yekutieli, A. (2011). On flatness and completion for infinitely generated modules over Noetherian rings. Communications in Algebra, 39(11), 4221-4245.
[32] Yekutieli, A. (2013). Duality and tilting for commutative DG rings. arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6411v4.
[33] Yekutieli, A. (2016). The squaring operation for commutative DG rings. Journal of Algebra, 449, 50-107.

UNIVERSITEIT ANTWERPEN, DEPARTEMENT WISKUNDE-INFORMATICA, MIDDELHEIM CAMPUS, MIDDELHEIMLAAN 1, 2020 ANTWERP, BELGIUM
E-mail address: Liran.Shaul@uantwerpen.be